

BACONIANA.

VOL. VIII. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1910. No. 32.

A FALSE-DATED BOOK.

A REMARKABLE DISCOVERY.

IN the last issue of BACONIANA I stated that the earliest date at which I had been able to find the A A device used as a headpiece was in 1563, when it appeared over the dedication, Ioanni Soto Philippi Regis in "De Furtivis Literatum Notis Vulgo. De Ziferis." Ioan Baptista Porta Neapolitano Authore. Cum Privilegio Neapoli, Apud Ioa Mariam Scotum.

When my books were being examined for that article by an expert wood engraver he insisted that the block there used in Naples in 1563 was the same as that printed from in London, in the appendix to Digge's "Stratoticos" in 1590, only it was newly engraved when used in London and had been much worn before being used in Naples. Obviously this was impossible, and apparently this was another instance of the unreliability of expert evidence.

On the 11th of August I received a book catalogue in which the 1563 edition of "De Ziferis" was offered at 10s. 6d., and as it was a low price I sent for it. On comparing it with the copy I previously had it differed in type, illustrative designs, head and tail pieces, initial letters; in fact, in every detail, although on the title-page the type had in one been chosen to represent that

of the other. The same words appeared on each page, but in the first copy there was a key-word at the bottom of each page which was absent in the later one. Here was a remarkable position :—Ioa. Maria Scotus had, in Naples in 1563, printed two editions of Baptista Porta's work on cyphers. For the illustration of each he had separate blocks printed; this meant that about fifty blocks relating only to the subject-matter of the book had been duplicated. What could be the explanation?

There was another difference. The volume last purchased had a list of 14 errata, and underneath the sentence "Auctoritate, Licentia R. D. Aloysii Campagnæ Episcopi Montis Pelusii ac Neapolitane Diocesis Vicarii."

In what proved to be the false-dated copy these fourteen mistakes had all been corrected, but another list of errata is printed in it containing 86 errors, of which 70 appear to have been unnoticed in the true Naples edition.

The initial blocks and tail pieces in the copy containing the A A headpiece seemed familiar to me, and after a careful search I found every one of them in books printed by Adam Islip after 1590. In fact, they may all be seen in the edition of Chaucer's works, 1598, and the translation by Loys le Roy, called *Regius* of "Aristotle's Politiques," published in the same year. It was evident, therefore, that on the title-page of the volume containing the A A design the date, the place of publication and the name of the publisher were incorrectly stated. The only explanation appeared to be that it was an English reprint, but that the fact that it was a reprint was not stated.

The book had been re-published in 1591 by John Wolph in London, and I had the good fortune to secure a copy from the first bookseller to whom I applied.*

* The 1563 false-dated copy is annotated throughout in Francis

On comparison it appeared that the 1591 edition and the 1563 false-dated edition had been printed from the same type and blocks. There is only one difference. The 1591 edition contains a dedication headed "Illustri et Excelso viro Henrico Perceio Comiti Northumbriæ, &c. Domini meo Colendissimo." This is on the page bearing the printer's signature, †2, and the following page. In the false-dated 1563 copy, for this is substituted the dedication which is identical with that in the other volume bearing date 1563, headed "Excellenti Viro Ioanni Soto Philippi Regis In hoc Regno A'Secretis Ioa. Maria Scotus." It is over this dedication that the A A headpiece appears.

A further comparison establishes the fact beyond doubt that the 1591 dated edition was printed off before the false-dated 1563 edition.

Here are the facts. In 1591 John Wolf re-published Baptista Porta's work on cyphers, published by Ioa Maria Scotus in Naples in 1563, but according to Spedding not *en vente* until 1568. This reprint was dedicated to Henry Percy, Earl of Northumberland. After the edition had been printed off, the title-page was altered to correspond with the 1563 publication, the dedication was taken out and a copy of the original dedication was substituted, and over this was placed the

Bacon's handwriting. As was his invariable custom he went through the errata, altered each one, and as he did so ticked off the schedule. When I opened the 1591 copy I was surprised to find there also Bacon's handwriting. Pages 221 to 224 have been misplaced, and at the bottom of page 220 is a note, "Vide sequentia in initio Libri post folium tertium." On the title-page, in feminine Italian hand, are the initials C. K. and the signature C. Killigrew. This is the signature of Lady Killigrew, who was Catherine Cooke, the sister of Lady Anne Bacon, and therefore Francis Bacon's aunt. She married Sir Henry Killigrew for her first husband and after his death she became the wife of Sir Henry Nevill.

A A headpiece. Then an edition was struck off which until to-day has been sold and re-sold as the first edition of Baptista Porta's work. Who did this and why was it done?

Y. LEDSEM.

[A further article on the A A headpieces is held over on account of lack of space.—ED. *Baconiana*.]

OMNES NUMEROS HABET.

MANY years ago this expression, used in English form by Ben Jonson, was somewhat eagerly discussed by combatants on the Bacon-Shakespeare question. The passage is well-known. In his "Discoveries" Ben Jonson says of Bacon, "He hath filled up all numbers, and performed that in our tongue which may be compared or preferred either to insolent Greece or haughty Rome." Baconians contended that the resemblance, verbal certainly, between this passage and another in Ben Jonson's poem, prefixed to the 1623 Folio of Shakespeare, cannot be entirely accidental,—and the most natural conclusion is that both passages refer to the same person, and that the identity of Bacon and Shakespeare is distinctly implied and implicitly affirmed. As an additional confirmation of this conclusion some Baconians claimed that the word *numbers*, used in the "Discoveries," signifies that Bacon was a poet and wrote in "Numbers." The late Dean Plumptre, writing to the Editor of the *Bacon Journal*, disputed this interpretation on the ground that,—as the Dean wrote,—“As a matter of fact the phrase does not necessarily imply poetic construction of any kind. Jonson clearly uses it as the equivalent of the Latin *omnes numeros habet*, and these words are used of completeness of any kind. The world is *expletus omnibus*

numeris, as it came from its Creator. ('Cicero De Nat. Deor.,' II. 13). The stoics said of virtue, *omnes numeros habet*. ('Cicero de Offic.,' III. 3). A book, whether in prose or verse, may be *numeris omnibus absolutus*. ("Pliny," Ep. XI. 38). An orator is said to *ire per omnes numeros eloquentiæ*. It is clear, I think, from this induction that an undue stress has been laid upon Ben Jonson's words, and that the meaning of *numerus* as poetry does not necessarily, if at all, find a place in them. He may have looked upon Bacon's philosophical works as attaining the highest degree of completeness, and placing him on a level with or above the philosophers of Greece or Rome."

Now it seems to me that whether the word *numbers* refers to poetry or not does not very much matter; the argument for the identification of Shakespeare and Bacon derived from the whole passage is not weakened by the ambiguity of a single word. Moreover, according to the most classical and restricted import of Jonson's words, poetry is *not* excluded, but rather included, in the meaning of the word *numbers*. For it is to be observed that when the word is used by Cicero, or Pliny, or classic writers generally, the word *numerus* has a correlative reference to some such word as *corpus*, and that the *corpus* is always defined,—its constituent parts being its *numeri*. For example, the *corpus honestum* (Cicero uses this word in the passage quoted by Dean Plumptre as referring to virtue) has for its constituents virtue, utility and pleasure. In all the passages you may ask the question and obtain an answer,—What is the entire *corpus* to which the *numeri* belong? So that Dean Plumptre's contention that philosophy may include all the numbers of which Jonson speaks is an arbitrary limitation of the *numeri*, and implies a grotesque and dismembered *corpus* having only one limb and no *numeri*.

In order to know what Ben Jonson means we must find the *corpus* of which his *numbers* are composed. He names several authors representing various branches of literary construction, and claims for Bacon a concentration of the different forms of construction which are represented singly by the authors whom he names. According to Dean Plumptre these all ought to be philosophers. But they are not ; and the qualities attributed to them do not include such philosophy as Bacon wrote at all. Ben Jonson's enumeration of the *numeri* is, eloquence, mastery of wit and language, vigour of *invention* (a very significant word, impossible to be applied to mere philosophy), strength of judgment, lettered qualities, oratory (especially in debate, attack or defence, under the stimulus of provocation), capacity to honour a language or help study. The list which Ben Jonson gives includes :—

1.—Sir Thomas Wyatt, who was “statesman, diplomatist, poet and prose writer—the first writer of sonnets in English. His ballads, sonnets and satire rank with those of Lord Surrey, as the firstfruits of modern English poetry.”

Here is one of Bacon's numeri.

2.—Henry Howard, Earl of Surrey, first writer of English blank verse. “The English Petrarch,” as J. M'Kail says. *Here is another.*

3.—Sir Thomas Challon, “enjoyed considerable reputation as a poet.” *Another.*

4.—Sir Thomas Smith, author of works on Greek and Latin study. *Another.*

5.—Sir Thomas Eliot, “the admiration of all the learned of his time, for the integrity of his life and variety of his accomplishments.” *Another.*

6.—Sir Nicholas Bacon, “had much of that penetrating genius, solidity, judgment, persuasive eloquence and

comprehensive knowledge of law and equity, that shone forth in his son." *Another.*

7.—Sir Philip Sydney, whose sonnets and other poems belong to English classic poetry. *Another.*

8.—Richard Hooker—the learned, eloquent, profoundly philosophic book "Ecclesiastical Polity" is his immortal monument. *Another.*

9.—Sir Henry Saville, historian, mathematician, astronomer. *Another.*

10.—George Sandys, translated Ovid's "Metamorphoses," and the first book of Virgil's "Æneid." His verse is praised by Dryden. *Another.*

Here is an illuminating commentary on the contention that Bacon's numbers referred to philosophy only and not to poetry. And as to this, it is to be noted that Ben Jonson speaks of Bacon's writings *in our tongue*. His philosophical works were written, except the *Advancement*, in Latin. If the whole of the *numeri* means philosophy, Ben Jonson's words are contradicted by his instances, and they are really absurd. For if the whole body is the eye of philosophy where is the hearing of rhythmic verse,—where the vigour of invention, and all the rest of the qualities enumerated and sampled? Evidently we must understand Ben Jonson as attributing poetry, *even more than philosophy*, to Bacon. It is vain to attempt to water down the words into one meaning. They express the unbounded admiration of a mood which cannot find language too strong and too comprehensive for eulogy.

In describing the men of wit mentioned by Ben Jonson I am indebted to the "Encyclopædia Britannica" and the "National Dictionary of Biography."

I am, however, not inclined to abandon the idea that the word *numbers* may have been used in rather a forced way, in order, by a sort of double sense, to leave the attribution of poetry as one ambiguously attached by

Ben Jonson himself to Bacon's name,—stating the fact in a not too compromising way for those who can read between the lines,—secreting a meaning which he did not feel himself at liberty to fully divulge. For in Ben Jonson's day, and for long afterwards, poetry was the most immediate significance of the word *numbers*. This is a sense which is now rarely used,—almost forgotten,—but it was colloquial and familiar in Jonson's day. Instances will readily occur. Longaville, in *Love's Labours Lost*, as he destroys a MS. containing poetry, says,—

“These *numbers* will I tear, and write in prose.”

Malvolio, after reading one stanza of a poem, finds the next written in a different rhythm, and exclaims, “What follows? The numbers altered.” Hamlet begins his love-letter in poetry, but lapses into prose with,—“O dear Ophelia, I am ill at these numbers.” (See also Sonnets 17 and 79). Milton's stanzas in praise of Shakespeare are well known. Pope says, “I lisped in numbers, for the numbers came.” Now, considering the fact that everything written by Jonson about Bacon and Shakespeare has a sort of mystic or evasive character, I cannot help thinking that we have here another specimen of literary prestidigitation by which he smuggled in the notion of poetry without making it too conspicuous or explicit, leaving room for a different meaning.

But we are not confined to the “Discoveries” in order to learn what Jonson meant by such numbers as Bacon possessed. In the twin passage in the Folio poem Jonson tells us what insolent Greece and haughty Rome could produce in rivalry of Bacon. Here poetry and dramatic construction are distinctly referred to as represented by Aschylus, Euripides, Sophocles, Pacca-vius, Accius, Seneca (of Ardoia). These are the *numeri*

of the *corpus* identically applied to Shakespeare in one place and naturally transferred to Bacon in the other. Moreover, great and splendid as are Bacon's prose and scientific writings, they do not in themselves justify the terms of Jonson's eulogy according to the limitation which we are asked to put upon his words. They do not so "fill up all numbers" as to baffle rivalry with all that Greece produced when its soaring was most daring, and all that Rome produced in the supremacy of its power, to challenge the pride and wonder of the world. Bacon's philosophy does not include many branches of metaphysics which Plato, Cicero, and ancient philosophers discussed. It relates chiefly to physical science and human fortune and conduct.

Ben Jonson *does* speak both of William Shakspeare and of Francis Bacon personally, and it is not difficult to discern in his references to Shakspeare a superior-person, patronising flavour, as if speaking of a charming nonentity; while as to Bacon his praises are so superlative that language fails him in the attempt to express his estimate of his greatness, never forsaking him in his greatest calamity. He can only express himself by abandoning mere didactic phraseology, and using concrete, and therefore inexhaustible, object-lessons. He transfers to him all the accumulated homage which he offers to the most distinguished literati of his own and of past ages, including that which he had officially bestowed on the poetry of Shakespeare. Also in other places, when he speaks of Bacon, he was apt to borrow tricks of speech from his dedicatory poem. Thus in the Folio poem he writes of "Shakespeare,"—

"Nature himself was proud of his designs,
And joyed to wear the dressing of his lines,
Which were so richly spun and woven so fit,
As since she will vouchsafe no other wit."

And in reference to Lord Bacon he writes,—

“Whose even thread the fates spun round and full
Out of their choicest and their whitest wool.”

It is true that Ben Jonson, in his eulogy of Bacon, does not name any dramatic writer. Perhaps he was too modest to name himself, and his self-valuation would not permit him to name anyone else. But the non-inclusion of any dramatist in Ben Jonson's collection of samples is of no importance in a list not intended to be scientific or complete. Certainly no such restriction to philosophy as Dean Plumptre required can be conceded to a list which includes Sir Philip Sydney, Wyatt, Surrey, Sydney, and Sandys.

The learned Dean considered that Jonson seemed purposely to exclude the dramatic form of composition from the “numbers” that Bacon fulfilled, while he leaves room for poetry in Bacon's paraphrases of the Psalms and occasional sonnets. Nothing can be more absurd than to claim that Bacon's paraphrases of the Psalms can entitle him to include poetry among the “numbers” which he fulfilled, and to take a rank side by side with the greatest poets. These poor Baconian fragments are certainly of only second-rate value, and are of lower quality than Sydney's poems. Jonson must have known that Bacon accomplished something better in his *numeri* than this,—he never penned anything half so absurd.

It may be hoped that this explanation of the entire force of Jonson's *numeri* may set this branch of our controversy in a clearer light. The necessity for this is not obsolete. In the most recently published work on the Baconian question, “Bacon is Shakespeare,” by Sir Edwin Durning-Lawrence, there is a reference to Jonson's phrase both in the text and in a footnote to the text (p. 64), and the two are almost self-

contradictory. In the text Sir Edwin says, "He who hath filled up all numbers means, unquestionably, He that hath written every kind of poetry." This is scarcely accurate, for a poet may be of the highest rank, although his range may be limited, and "all numbers" means more than poetry. Homer did not write love lyrics, and neither Homer nor Virgil nor Milton (limiting our enumeration to the "three poets in three distant ages born," who are recognised as supreme), wrote dramas. It means all varieties of literary construction. Sir Edwin's footnote ambiguously recognises this, for he writes, "*Numeri* is also used merely in the sense of *parts*." If so, "numbers" cannot "*unquestionably*" mean "every kind of poetry." Also, Rev. Geo. O'Neil is quoted, who, "in a little brochure entitled, 'Could Bacon have Written the Plays?' contends that '*Numeri*' in Latin,—'Numbers' in English,—applied to literature, means *nothing else than verse*, and even seems to exclude prose,"—which shows that the reverend gentleman must have overlooked or forgotten both the classic and the English use of these words.

And lastly, the very omission of Shakespeare's name from Ben Jonson's list of wits is remarkable. Ben Jonson must have known how supreme Shakespeare was in dramatic writing; no one could better appreciate his transcendent supremacy, and the omission of his name requires explanation. I can find no other than the Baconian.

R. M. THEOBALD.

BACON'S LAST RESTING PLACE.

BEFORE dealing with the subject of this article I want to remove a possible error in the word-cipher, as to the house at which the Queen and Dudley were secretly married a few days after the death of Dudley's wife Amy, which occurred on 8th September, 1560.

There was a Sir William Pickering but no Lord Puckering at that date, and Bacon's information or recollection, or perhaps his decipherer's, may have been the cause of what now appears to me a mis-statement.

Brook House, Hackney, with its fine orchards and gardens (see Miss Leith's account in *BACONIANA*, 1908), had belonged to Henry VIII.; but his son, Edward VI., gave it to William Herbert, first Earl of Pembroke, (at the second creation of the Earldom).

Pembroke was rich, had troops of retainers, great influence in State affairs, and had married a sister of Henry VIII.'s last wife. He was a keen Protestant, strongly supported Henry VIII. in his refusal to continue the English Church subject to the supremacy of the Pope of Rome, and when Henry VIII. died was trustee of his Will. He was one of a Privy Council of twelve who managed the kingdom while the boy king, Edward VI., occupied the throne, and firmly backed the claims of the Protestant Lady Jane Grey to the throne on the young King's death. He managed to hold his own during the five years that Queen Mary, the Catholic, was on the throne, and immediately on her death proceeded with Cecil to Hatfield to arrange with Princess Elizabeth to make her proclamation as Queen and secure that the Protestant religion should be restored. At that date he was nearly sixty years of age. The Queen's position in September, 1560, having become very critical, and knowing what we do of Earl

Pembroke's firm action hitherto in matters of State importance, it is probable that he placed Brook House, Hackney, at the disposal of the Queen and Dudley for the place of nuptials.

The parish of Hackney was a quiet one in those days—its distance is about five miles from Westminster—and there is great probability that it was the house of Lord P. referred to in the cipher story. According to Miss Leith the Queen did once stay there and had the key of the parish church in her possession during the visit.

The child, a boy, thus legitimatised, was born four months later, viz., 22nd January, 1560—61, but Elizabeth, unable to face the public, concealed the birth, and the infant was passed to the care of Lady Ann Bacon and brought up nominally as her son. In the previous month Francis II. of France had died and the child was fitly named after him. According to Mr. J. A. Froude the early months of 1560—61 were occupied with negotiations with King Philip of Spain; Dudley offering that if he would recognise and support an open public marriage the Queen would restore the primacy of the Roman Catholic Church. At this time Mary Queen of Scots, an ardent Catholic, was heiress presumptive to the English throne.

Anyone interested in this romantic story should turn to Mrs. Gallup's book on the biliteral cipher. In that part deciphered from the "History of Life and Death," 1623, they will find that Lord P. (Pembroke) "having strong suspicion that these might at a remote date perchance be required had himself made written testimony concerning the ceremony of the Queen's nuptials and had obtained other substantive written testimony confirming the marriage and of Francis 'Bacon's' birth certified by the physician, nurse, midwife and Lady Ann Bacon." In this we again see the action of a firm statesman,

zealous for the Protestant succession at a period of much vacillation on the part of the Queen.

Had he lived history might have been very different, but in 1569 he died and by his will Dudley, then Earl of Leicester, and Sir Nicholas Bacon, by codicil, were appointed with others to oversee its administration.

If the marriage and birth declarations were in Earl Pembroke's possession at his death these two overseers were doubtless the channel by which the papers went eventually into the control of the Queen, who after a time destroyed them.

Another interesting personality came on the scene later, namely, Lady Ann Clifford, born 1589, died 1675. Her father was George, Earl of Cumberland, champion at tilt to the Queen; her mother was niece of the Countess of Warwick, wife of Ambrose Dudley, brother to the Earl of Leicester. Her two brothers, with the significant names of Francis and Robert, died in infancy, whereby Lady Ann eventually succeeded as heiress to her father's large landed estates.

In February, 1608—9, at the respective ages of nineteen, Lady Ann married Richard, third Earl of Dorset. The young people were prominent at the tilts and ceremonies of the Court of James I., and lived during most of their married life at Dorset House in Fleet Street, where they entertained with much magnificence. Francis visited there, as a letter or letters from him were dated from Dorset House, and evidently enjoyed their close friendship. Earl Dorset shared Bacon's antipathy to Robert Cecil, Earl of Salisbury, and made some strong remarks about Salisbury just after the latter's death. Earl Dorset died in 1624 and his widow in 1630 married the then Earl of Pembroke and Montgomery, grandson of the Earl already mentioned in this recital.

There are two curious incidents in the career of Lady

Ann Clifford. Taking them out of their order of date, the first incident happened about 1674, shortly before her death, and at an age when irritability has a tendency to overcome the caution and reticence of a lifetime.

Sir Joseph Williamson, Secretary of State to Charles II., wrote asking her to let him nominate the Parliamentary candidate for her pocket-borough of Appleby. According to Hartley Coleridge's account of her in "Northern Worthies," the old lady replied: "I have been bullied by an usurper; I have been neglected by a Court; but I will not be dictated to by a subject. Your man shaln't stand."

Coleridge was disposed to think the letter unauthentic. To some the suggestion that James I. was a usurper (Bacon in the biliteral story uses the same expression) would cause surprise, and a private copy of it was probably taken. The letter was printed for the first time in a London newspaper, *The Globe*, in 1753. At that date the Stuart young Pretender had only six years before been defeated at Culloden Moor, and the Jacobite movement was still seething. The letter was an opportune reminder that the Pretender's title had (according to a lady likely to know) one extremely weak link in it.

I now go back to the year 1620, about the time Francis was sixty years old. It is a period of life when the subject of tombs and monuments presents itself for something more than a passing glance. Somebody seems to have been busy with one in Stratford Church while Lady Dorset was providing a good round sum for a monument to "Spencer" in Westminster Abbey. It occurs to me as a circumstance of suspicion that a lady who could never have seen the little man with short hair from Ireland—she was a child when he died in London in January, 1598—9, and was alleged to have

been buried in the Abbey at the charge of Robert, Earl of Essex—should be doing this. Still more that the deceased "Spenser's" name should be misspelt, his date of birth be given forty years wrong, and of his death almost three. Could the inscription be one of those which, according to the rule of the Rosy Cross brotherhood, must be ambiguous? But if Francis "Bacon," the rightful though unthroned king, had a natural desire to have his body deposited there after death it is clear to me his desire could only have been effected "under the rose." He would have to prepare his monument beforehand, and as James I. never seems to have known that Francis was "Spenser" the poet (otherwise there would have been trouble over the *Duessa Cantos* in the "*Fairie Queene*") a monument erected to "Spencer" by a rich titled supposed admirer of the poet had good chance of passing scrutiny. According to Mr. Granville Cuninghams' able article in *BACONIANA*, 1907, the inscription is as follows:—

" Here lyes (expecting the Second
Coming of Our Saviour Christ
Jesus) the body of Edmund Spencer
the Prince of Poets in his Tyme
whose Divine Spirit needs noe
other witness than the works
which he left behind him
He was borne in London
In the year 1510 and
died in the year
1596."

To further guard against the frustration of his object he would and did give in his will special direction that his body should be buried in the Church of St. Michael's, St. Albans. "There was my mother buried."

Bacon is alleged and supposed to have died in April, 1626. Charles I. had just ascended the English throne,

and I have information, of a private nature at present, that in fear of violence from the King, Bacon feigned death, and owing to the opiate he took in order to perfect the simulation while his body was being removed for "burial," nearly did lose his life. He succeeded in effecting a hiding for the remainder of his natural life. The truth of this account is in considerable degree verified by curious phenomena.

The monumental effigy, for instance, at St. Michael's Church only informs us that Francis Bacon in the year 1626, at the age of 66, sat in a particular posture upon a not very comfortable looking chair :—

"Sic Sedebat."

Another cryptic observation in Latin on the monument is—

"Composita Solvuntur."

Mr. W. F. Wigston translated it as "Let compounds be dissolved," but considered it capable of a variety of meanings.

Sir Wm. Dugdale has it :—

"Let the companions (body and soul) be parted."

There are differences of opinion as to the possibility of tracing the eventuations of the soul, but when we go in search of the body we can exclaim with Hans Breitmann—

Where ish dat barty now ?

All gon'd afay mit der lager beer

Afay in de ewigkeit !

As to the whereabouts of his alleged death persons accustomed to exactitude of statement such as Rawley, Dr. Sprat, Dr. Heylin and others, differ completely.

The houses of Dr. Parry, of Dr. Withybourne, of Sir Julius Cæsar and of the Earl of Arundel have each been vouched as the place of death.

The body of Francis Bacon is not at St. Michael's Church, St. Albans—so stated Mr. C. le Poer Kennedy in "Notes and Queries"; so stated the late Earl Verulam in conversation with Mrs. C. M. Pott. A party of experts examined every coffin before the crypts were bricked up by order of the Board of Works. The coffin of Francis Bacon was not there.

Bacon's inability to pass by a jest and Mr. Stone Booth's ability to solve acrostics are responsible for the next announcement. The "Spenser" grave at Westminster Abbey was prepared for the reception of the body of Francis "Bacon," the base-begotten son of Queen Elizabeth. Turn to the monumental inscription, take from the bottom upward, the first "f," the next "r," the next "a," to the "r" and so on, and you will spell Francis Bacon; the last "n" being in the word "expecting," and the cryptic sentence will read:

"Francis Bacon I expect lyes here."

There is one fly in the ointment. When I compared Mr. Cuninghams's copy of the inscription with the tablet and book, I found the word "than" is there spelt "then." To the Rosicrucian brotherhood skilled in Bacon's acroamatic methods of publication this would present little difficulty, as they would esteem it to be, what it probably was, a "null" to baffle the inexpert.

The question I ask myself is: Did that little Academe of Established Church parsons and literary and scientific men enrolled as the brotherhood of the Rosy Cross succeed in getting Bacon's body into the Abbey?

These men Bacon had left to continue to strive within the scope of their foreshortened horizon to bring about the better moral and mental hinterland that, as witness Mr. H. G. Wells, remains still a glorious aspiration only. They were very loyal to his secrets and his great plans for the advancement of knowledge. Did they get his body into the Abbey?

Bacon must have been dead when Rawley published the book with the interesting title, "Resuscitatio," in 1657. Rawley was a clergyman and a man of rectitude. His word may be taken as to the facts recorded in his "Life of Bacon," unless he warns us to be prepared for a feigned or garbled account. It was not to be expected the reverend chaplain, towards the close of his own years, would dissimulate without first effecting a truce with his conscience by making it somewhat plain that he was about so to do. In his Epistle to the Reader he wrote: "Not leaving anything to a future hand which I found to be of moment and *communicable to the Publick.*" Surely that is the *suppressio veri*? In the same Epistle is his *suggestio falsi*: "*I shall not tread too near upon the heels of truth.*" But while the exterior message, *ad captandum vulgus*, was incorrect, the interior epistle in biliteral cipher may disclose a correct statement of the doings of Francis Bacon up to the time he did actually pay the debt of nature.

Bacon's body was eventually secretly deposited in the Abbey, or else I cannot understand the cackling that proceeded from the Rosicrucian hen-roost in 1679. They published in that year two books, the one apropos of nothing in particular, badly printed, the exterior printed writings of no real value or importance. The title, however, mattered. It was

"BACON'S REMAINS."

The other book, a Spenser Folio, has the Spenser

"TOMB"

for frontispiece, and a feigned "Life," the first collection of inaccuracies which have gone to make up lives of the journeyman tailor's son, whom our literary wise-acres identify as the poet Spenser.

From the reprints of the "Shepherd's Calendar" later than 1591, Mr. Cuninghame shows that a stanza

for June had been consistently omitted. Even in a Latin translation of 1653 the Latin was there but not the English. The verse, as in 1591 and restored in 1679, begins:—

“Now he is dead and lyeth wrapt in lead.”

Yes, the body of Francis “Bacon” lies sure enough in a grave below the monument he had prepared in Westminster Abbey, the time-honoured shrine of our English sovereigns. It is its proper place of sepulture.

THE ABBEY STATUE TO SHAKSPEARE.

For the following reasons I think the statue to “Shakspeare,” erected in Westminster Abbey in 1741, was put there by brethren of the Society of the Rosy Cross in memory of Francis Bacon, the founder of their Order.

1. It followed the rule of the Society that monuments to deceased brethren should disclose little to the outside public, and any inscription should be ambiguous in its wording.

The statue is unlike in any particular the bust of Shakspeare in Stratford Church.

The head is shown supported by one of the hands, in that respect resembling the attitude of the effigy of Francis Bacon in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans. The inscription is:—

GULIELMO SHAKSPEARE,
Anno post mortem CXXIV.
Amor publicus posuit.

According to the *Gentleman's Magazine* of February, 1741, “anno” should have been “annis,” “mortem” was not so good as “obitum,” and “amor,” a passion, could not be said to act.

The omission of the first “e” in the well-known literary name “Shakspeare” is curious but not singular,

as it is also omitted from the inscription of the Stratford bust. The date, CXXIV., was incorrect in 1741, but not so for a statue erected before 25th March.

2. The statue was erected at the instance of four men, two of whom, viz., Richard Boyle, third Earl of Burlington, and Dr. Mead, were prominent members of the Council of the Royal Society. A third, Thomas Martin, was equally prominent in the Society of Antiquaries (founded by Inns of Court students during Elizabeth's reign), and the fourth was Alexander Pope, the poet.

The device on the seal of the Royal Society indicates that it too dated from Elizabeth's reign and was originally known as the "Order of the Helmet," founded by Francis Bacon about the year 1595.*

3. The Earl of Burlington, celebrated for his architectural tastes and his friendship with artists and men of letters, was rich and lavish in his expenditure. He could have well afforded the whole cost of the statue; so could Dr. Mead, the leading physician of that day. It was evidently thought advisable, however, to give the erection of the monument the aspect of having emanated from the general public, and the proceeds of the performances at two theatres were obtained as contributions.

That Alexander Pope was in the inner circle of the Society of the Rosy Cross may be gathered in two ways. First, his panegyric to the memory of Francis Bacon, whom he styled "the wisest, brightest, meanest of mankind." Meanest in this association was the term for humblest.† Secondly, had he not been of the inner circle he would not have had access to the manuscript of Bacon's prose argument of the "Iliad." The similarity between this prose argument

† * With helmet on your mouth was sealed.

† See Miss Leith at page 256 of *BACONIANA*, 1905.

and Pope's versification of the "Iliad" has been alleged as proof of the want of genuineness of Mrs. Gallup's decipher of the prose argument. On the other hand, the circumstantial evidence that Pope had access to Bacon's manuscript is convincing. For instance, "bold" is not in the original Greek. It was used by Pope in his manuscript at the British Museum (inaccessible to the decipherer) in the Boetian passage, where it appears just as in the decipher of Bacon's prose argument, viz., "bold Clonius." In Pope's finally printed work the word "bold" is not used. Yet we find Pope making use of it later on in the Ormenian passage, where it is also not in the Greek text—

"The *bold* Ormenian and Asterian bands."

4. The scroll beside the Abbey statue, to which the figure's left hand points, has upon it a portion of a well-known passage in the *Tempest*. The portion begins at the line—

"The cloud-capt towers the gorgeous pallaces."

Its appropriateness may be judged by the fact that the passage occurs in the concluding address to the decipherer of the word cipher in the Shakespeare folio of 1623.

Anyone who has become familiar with the word cipher story, extracted by Dr. Owen from the Shakespeare folio, and certain other works of Francis Bacon, whether vizarded or acknowledged, will be aware that Bacon's epistle to his decipherer begins in the 1st Scene of the 1st Act of the first history play, *King John*, in the first folio Shakespeare, as follows:—

"My dear Sir

Thus leaning on mine elbow I begin."

The epistle ends in the 8th Scene of the first comedy, *Tempest*, in the same folio:—

"Be cheerfull Sir

Our revels now are ended : these our actors

(As I foretold you) were all spirits and
 Are melted into ayre into thin ayre
 And like the baseless fabricke of this vision
 The clowd-capt towers the gorgeous pallaces
 The solemne temples the great Globe it selfe
 Yea all which it inherit shall dissolve
 And like this insubstantial pageant faded,
 Leave not a racke behinde ; we are such stuffe
 As dreams are made on and our little life
 Is rounded with a sleepe."

This profoundly emotional farewell from Francis Bacon to his decipherer was fitly associated with the Abbey statue to the memory of Francis Bacon, the founder and one-time leader of the Society of the Rosy Cross.

5. The year 1741 was the centenary of his actual demise.*

PARKER WOODWARD.

[Some months ago I purchased a copy of "The Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon," by Peter Shaw, M.D., 3 vols., large 4to., 1733. The volumes are uncut and in original boards re-backed. Only the evening before the above article came to hand I unpacked the books. The first volume contains two title-pages in different print. I found to my astonishment pasted on the fly-leaf, opposite to the first of these, an old print, 7 in. \times 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ in., of Shakespeare's monument in Westminster Abbey. The book-binder to whom the volume was submitted was of opinion from the character of the leather that it was re-backed early in the last century, that the print was on the fly-leaf before it was re-backed, and in order to strengthen it the fly-leaf had been pasted to the board. In the other two volumes the fly-leaf is not pasted on the board. On the back of the first title-page is pasted another print, 7 in. \times 3 $\frac{1}{4}$ in., oblong. The subject is apparently a meeting of a learned Society. There are thirteen figures, of which six are dressed as divines and the remainder are in costumes of Queen Anne's period. They are standing round a large model of a system of the spheres with the earth in

* Almost at the foot of the Abbey monument there is a grave stated to be of a certain Edward "Tudor." Is this genuine or feigned?

the centre. There is a large sextant and scientific apparatus placed about, and an anchor is suspended from the ceiling. Unquestionably these prints have been in their present position more than a hundred years. In the print of the monument the inscription on the tablet over the head commences GULIEMO SHAKESPEARE. There is a distinct space between the E and the S which does not occur between any two of the other letters. It is certainly a remarkable circumstance that an engraving of Shakespeare's monument should be found with an engraving of what appears to be a meeting of a scientific society inserted in a copy of Bacon's works.—ED.]

BACON IS SHAKESPEARE.

I HAVE, in my recently published book, proved that the "authentic" portrait which forms the title-page of the Great Folio of the plays, is a mere dummy cunningly composed of two left arms surmounted by a mask. This was done in order to teach those capable of understanding that William Shakespeare, of Stratford-upon-Avon, gentleman, was merely a "left hand," a "mask," a "pseudonym" of Francis Bacon. As I desired to make my book little more than a mere revelation of facts that could neither be controverted nor explained away, I carefully avoided referring to any of the very numerous ways in which Bacon "signed the plays." But now I will refer to one very simple series of signatures.

For reasons to which it is not here necessary to refer, Bacon selected as one of the important keys to the mystery of his authorship of various anonymous works, more particularly of his authorship of the immortal plays known to us under the name of Shakespeare,

THE NUMBER 53.

The Great Folio of the plays of 1623 is divided into Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies. Each of these, although they are all bound in one volume, is separately

paged. It follows, therefore, that there must be three pages numbered 53 in the Folio Volume of Shakespeare's plays. I must also remind readers that every page is divided into two columns, and it is absolutely certain that the author himself so arranged these that he knew in what column and in what line in such column every word should appear in the printed page.

Let us examine, in the first instance,

THE FIRST PAGE 53

in the plays. The second column of this page 53 commences with the first scene of the fourth act of the *Merry Wives of Windsor*. In this act a Welsh schoolmaster, "Evans," "Dame Quickly," and a boy named "William" appear. The object of the introduction of the Welshman seems to have been that he might mispronounce "c" as "g," and so call "hic" "hig," and "hoc" "hog." William also is made wrongly to say that the accusative case is "hinc" instead of "hunc," and Evans, the Welsh schoolmaster, who should have corrected this error made by the boy, repeats the blunder with the change of "c" into "g," so as to give without confusion the right signature key-words which appear in the second column of the first page 53, as follow:—

"Eva(ns): I pray you, have your remembrance
(childe) accusativo, hing, hang, hog?

"Qu(ickly): Hang-hog is latten for Bacon, I
warrant you."

Note, "Bacon" is spelled with a capital "B," and also note that in this way we are told quite clearly that Hang-hog means Bacon. In very numerous instances a hog with a halter (a rope with a slip-knot) round its neck appears as part of the title-page of various books to which Bacon's name has not yet been publicly attached. I shall again refer to "Hang-hog" as we proceed.

Next, let us carefully examine

THE SECOND PAGE 53

in the Folio of the plays, which in the first column contains the commencement of the first scene of the second act of the first part of *King Henry the Fourth*. Two carriers are conversing, and we read :—

“ 1 Car(rier) : What, ostler ! Come away, and be hanged to you.

“ 2 Car(rier) : I have a Gammon of Bacon.”

Note that gammon is spelled with a capital “G,” and Bacon also is spelled with a capital “B.” Thus we have found Bacon in the second page 53. But we must not forget that this second page 53 is really and evidently of set purpose falsely numbered 53, because page 46 is immediately followed by 49, there being no page numbered 47 or 48 in the Histories, the second part of the plays.

We have found what appears to be a revelation in each of the first two pages, numbered 53 in the First Folio. But we must remember that a Baconian revelation, in order to be complete, satisfactory, and certain, requires to be repeated “three” times. The uninformed inquirer will not be able to perceive upon the third page 53, on which is found the beginning of *The Tragedie of Romeo and Juliet*, any trace of Bacon, or hog, or pig, or anything suggesting such things. The initiated will know that the great “Arch-Mason” will supply two visible pillars, but that the third pillar will be the invisible pillar, the Shibboleth ; therefore, the informed will not expect to find the third key upon the visible page 53, but upon

THE INVISIBLE PAGE 53.

Those who use their brains will not fail to perceive that the invisible page 53 must be the page that is 53,

when we count not from the beginning, but from the end of the book of Tragedies, that is, from the end of the volume.

The last page in the Folio is 399. This is falsely numbered 993, not by accident nor by a misprint, but (as the great cryptographic book, 1624, will tell those who are able to read it) because 993 forms the word "Baconus," a signature for Bacon. Let us repeat that the last page of the Great Folio of the plays is page 399, and deducting 53 from 399 we obtain the number 346, which is

THE PAGE 53 FROM THE END.

On this page, upon the first column, we find a portion of Act II., Scene 2, of *The Tragedie of Anthony and Cleopatra*, and we there read :—

"Enobar(bus): Or if you borrow one
another's love for the
instant, you may, when you heare no
more words of

Pompey, return it again ; you shall have
time to wrangle
in, when you have nothing else to do.

Anth(ony): Thou art a souldier, onely
speake no more.

Enob(arbus): That trueth should be
silent, I had almost for-
got.

Anth(ony): You wrong this presence."

Now here we perceive that "Pompey," "in," and "got," by the manner in which the type is arranged in the Folio, come directly under each other, and, their initial letters being P.I.G., we quite easily read "pig," which is what we were looking for.

But on this "invisible" page 53, in which the key-word is found, other very important revelations may be discovered, because it is the "Shibboleth" page. Let us count all the lines that come to the left-hand edge of

the column on this page 346, and we shall find that Pompey, which begins the word "pig," is upon

THE 43RD LINE (No. 1).

Bacon very frequently signed with some form of cypher the first page of his secret books. Let us, then, look at the very first page of the Great Folio of 1623, on which is the commencement of the play of *The Tempest*. Upon the first column of that first page we read upon

THE 43RD LINE (No. 2)—

"is perfect Gallowes : stand fast good
Fate to his han-
ging, make the rope of his destiny our
cable for our
owne doth little advantage : If he be not
borne to bee
hang'd, our case is miserable."

Here, reading upwards from hang'd, we read hang'd, H.O.G., the "h" of hang'd being twice used. And just as "Pompey," the commencement of Pig, is upon the 43rd line of page 346 (the invisible page 53); so here on page one the commencing word, "hang'd," is also upon the 43rd line (counting all the lines without exception). Note that it is only made possible for us to read "hang'd hog," because, by the printer's "error," hanging is divided improperly as han-ging instead of hang-ing. Of course, this apparent misprint is a most careful arrangement made by the great author himself.

There are no misprints or errors in the First Folio, 1623, because the great author was alive and most carefully arranged every column in every page, and every line in every page, and every word in every page, so that we should find every word exactly as and where we do find such particular word. "Hang'd hog" is therefore clearly the signature of the great author upon the

first page of the Folio, just as 993 is his signature upon the last page of the Folio.

But, as I have already said, in order to obtain a full, certain and complete revelation, we must discover a third example. This we shall find upon

THE FIRST PAGE 43 (No. 3),

in the second column of which appears the 1st Scene of the 2nd Act of *The Merry Wives of Windsor*. Here we read as follows :—

“Mis. Page : What’s the matter, woman ?

Mi Ford : O woman, if it were not for
our trifling re-
spect, I could come to such honour.

Mi Page : Hang the trifle (woman) take
the honour.”

Here, reading upwards from Hang, we get quite clearly S.O.W., and we perceive that “Hang-sow” is just as much Bacon as is Hang-hog. Thus we get a triplet of No. 43, as we had a triplet of page 53.

We should also realise that we get a third triplet, because we find

HANG-HOG (No. 1).

on page 1 in the “Comedies,” the first portion of the plays, and we find

HANG-SOW (No. 2),

which is practically the same thing as Hang-hog, upon page 43 in the “Comedies,” the first portion of the plays, and we find that

HANG-HOG IS LATTEN FOR BACON. (No. 3)

is on page 53 in the “Comedies,” the first portion of the plays, and “Hang-hog is Bacon,” gives the Shibboleth and affords the explanation of the two previous examples. Thus we have a revelation of Bacon’s

authorship of the plays in three times, "three" forms, and the revelation is therefore "absolutely perfect."

THE NUMBER 36.

There are thirty-six plays in the First Folio of 1623. This is not accidental. Thirty-six is a cabalistic number, and is used in several of Bacon's works when he referred to plays or the plays of Shakespeare.

THE 36TH ESSAY

in the Italian edition of Bacon's "Essays," which was published in London in 1618, is entitled "Fattioni" (stage plays).

THE 36TH ANTITHETA.

In the Latin edition of Bacon's "Advancement of Learning," published in 1623, the same year in which the plays appeared, the XXXVI. Antitheta commences, "Amorum multa debet scena (stage plays)," and when the English edition of Bacon's "Advancement of Learning" was brought out in 1640, the XXXVI. Antitheta commences with the words "The Stage."

THE 36TH APOPHTHEGM.

In the collection of Bacon's "Apophthegms," printed (I think for the first time) in 1671, Apophthegm 36 reads as follows, and fully explains the meaning of "Hang-hog is latten for Bacon, I warrant you" :—

"Sir Nicholas Bacon, being appointed a Judge for the Northern Circuit, and having brought his Trials that came before him to such a pass, as the passing of sentence on Malefactors, he was by one of the Malefactors mightily importuned for to save his life, which when nothing that he had said did avail, he at length desired his mercy on the account of kindred : Prethee, said my Lord Judge, how came that in ? Why, if it please you my Lord, your name is Bacon, and mine is Hog, and in all Ages

Hog and Bacon have been so near kindred, that they are not to be separated. I [Aye], but, replied Judge Bacon, you and I cannot be kindred except you be hanged; for Hog is not Bacon until it be well hanged."

PAGE 53.

At a very early date Bacon selected the number "53" to give in numerous books revelations concerning his authorship. In Florio's "Second Frutes," published in 1591, on page 53 we read:—

"H. : A slice of bacon would make us taste this wine well.

S. : What ho, set that gammon of bakon upon the board."

Florio was always a servant of Bacon's, and received a pension for "making my lord's works known abroad." The above is inserted on page 53 to inform us that Bacon's name may be spelled in many different ways, as students of various books will find to be the fact.

In the "Mikrokosmos," published at Antwerp, both in Latin and in French, in 1592, we get on page 53 a picture of Circe's Island, which represents "the stage." Beneath it are the words from the Proverbs: "Stolen waters are sweet, and bread eaten in secret is agreeable."

On examining the engraving we perceive in the forefront Bacon's boar, drawn exactly as it is heraldically portrayed in Bacon's crest, but with a man's head surmounted by a "Cap of Liberty," and we should remember the words in Shakespeare's play, *As You Like It* (which means "Wisdom from the mouth of a clown"):—

"I must have liberty : . . .

To blow on whom I please, for so fooles have . . .

Invest me in my motley : Give me leave

To speak my mind, and I will through and through

Cleanse the foule bodie of the infected world
If they will patiently receive my medicine."

In Bacon's "Advancement of Learning," 1640, first edition in English, we find a first page "53." In the margin of this page we find "Alexand"; (Bacon sometimes alluded to himself as Alexander). But the page 55 is misnumbered "53," and on this second and false page "53" we read in the margin

S. FRAN.

BACON,

all in capital letters, almost the only marginal capital letters in the whole of the book, which is Bacon's own book, and yet it has this striking reference to himself on the false page "53." The number of pages "53" (very frequently falsely paged "53"), in which some reference to Bacon or to the plays may be discovered, is very large. I will, however, quote only two or three other instances.

In Rowe's edition of Shakespeare's plays, 1709, which is the fifth edition, there is a proper page 53, and also 55 is misprinted 53 (being the only mispagination in the whole book of 3,324 pages), and this is made in the false page 53 in order to afford us a revelation if we carefully read both pages "53" together.

In 1664 seven extra plays of W. Shakespeare's were added to the previous thirty-six plays, and the editors, in order to mislead the informed and pretend that they had Bacon's authority for so adding some of his inferior plays to his revised selection of the thirty-six plays which formed the Great Folio of 1623, numbered two pages 53, which they placed opposite to each other, and on each of these we find "S. Albans" (Bacon was Viscount S. Alban).

In referring to the "Mikrokosmos" of 1592, I

omitted to mention that the title-page is headed with the figure of a chameleon, which forms the "53rd" of "Alciati's Emblems." The chameleon was supposed to assume all appearances, and is therefore used as an emblem for Bacon, who assumed so many masks in order to do good to all mankind, though in a "despised weed."

We must never forget Bacon started with the avowed intention of "creating an English language capable of fitly expressing the noblest thoughts," and that he succeeded in accomplishing this mighty task by means of the Great Folio of the plays, which contains about 15,000 different words, nearly half of which he himself invented, and also by means of King James I.'s Authorised Version of the Bible, in which in the Introduction we are told by the translators (who worked under Bacon) that they had endeavoured to preserve every word in the English language in order that no word might be deemed to be merely secular.

EDWIN DURNING LAWRENCE.

PHILOSOPHERS AND PHILOSOPHIES COMPARED.

"**R**EFLECTIONS Upon Ancient and Modern Philosophy," translated from the French by A. L., is the title of a book printed for William Whitwood, in Duck-Lane, near West-Smithfield, in 1686. The following references to Bacon occur in it. They are reproduced here because of the very significant statement that Bacon was a Cabalist.

After mentioning Rullandus, a German Physician, and Paracelsus, the author says on page 51: "To these three Philosophers may be added Cornelius Agrippa,

Arnoldus de villa nova, Peter of Apono, Bacon and some other Cabalists, of whom Agrippa himself speaks in his Epistle to the Abbot Trithemius."

On page 53 he says: "And of all the modern Philosophers, those that have made greatest noise, are Galilæus an Italian, Bacon, Hobbes, and Boile English, Gassendus and Descartes French, and Vanhelmont Dutch-man. Galilæus seems to be the most ingenious of all; and he I think may be called the Father of Modern Philosophy. His Method resembles much that of the Platonists, his Stile is pleasant; and by his manner of Writing he conceals many defects: though he hath copied many things from the Primitive Philosophers, yet all seems to be his own, and he is taken for the original in several places, where he is but the transcriber. Bacon has a ranging wit which dives not deep into anything; his too great reach hinders him from being exact, the most part of his sentiments are rather Overtures for meditation, than Maxims to be followed: His Opinions are somewhat subtile and sparkling; and if they may be rightly considered, they resemble more sparks of fire, than an entire and natural light. Hobbes is obscure without delight, singular in his Notions, learned, but not very solid, and inconstant in his Doctrine; for he is sometimes Epicurean, sometimes Peripatetick. Boile is exact in his Observations; no man in Europe hath enriched Philosophy with so many Experiments as he; he reasons upon his Experiments with indifferent good consequence; which after all are not always unquestionable; because his principles are not always certain: he is in a word, an able Philosopher and great Naturalist. Gassendus, who desired only to pass for the Restorer of the Philosophy of Democritus and Epicurus, speaks little of his own head; there is nothing almost in him but the beauty of stile, that may give him the credit of an admirable Author: To refute

his Natural Philosophy there needs no more but the Arguments of Aristotle against Democritus and his Deciples. Descartes is one of the most extraordinary genius's that hath appeared in these last times; one of a fertile wit and profound mediation: the concatenation of his Doctrine reaches his point; the order of it is well devised according to his principles; and his Systeme, though made up of the ancient and modern, is well digested. The truth is, he teaches men too much to doubt, and that is no good model for spirits naturally incredulous: but in fine, he is more original than others. Vanhelsmont, through the knowledge which he had of Nature after his way, performed such prodigious things by his Remedies, that he was put into the Inquisition, upon suspicion that what he did was above the power of nature. In a word, Galileus is the most agreeable of the moderns, Bacon the most subtle, Gassendus the most learned, Hobbes the most plodding and thoughtful, Boile the most curious, Descartes the most ingenious, and Vanhelsmont the greatest Naturalist, but too much wedded to Paracelsus. The most universal method of his Philosophy, is the sympathy and antipathy of Simples and mixt Bodies, which he well understood."

NEWES FROM SPAYNE.

IN 1620 were published two editions of a tract entitled "Vox Populi, or Newes from Spayne, translated according to the Spanish coppie. Which may serve to forewarn both England and the United Provinces how farre to trust to Spanish pretences." Neither edition bears the name of a printer or publisher. The type has been re-set for the second edition, in which four typographical errors, noted at the end of the first edition. have been corrected. The earlier

issue bears certain marks peculiar to Bacon-printed pamphlets.

The tract is not, as it purports to be, a translation, but was evidently written with a view to prejudice public opinion in England against the projected marriage of Prince Charles with the Infanta of Spain. It contains an account of a special meeting of all the States of Spain, "together with the Presidents of the Counsel of Castile, of Arragon, of Italy, of Portugall, of the Indies, of the Treasure, of Warie, and especially of the holy Inquisition," which was held at Monson in Arragon, under the presidency of the Duke of Lerma, to hear from Seigneur Gondomar, an account of his ambassadorship in England.

The following is an extract from the report of the proceedings:—

"But (quoth the Inquisitor generall) how doe they for bookes, when they haue occasion either to write or dispute ?

"My Lord, (replyes Gondamor) all the Libraries belonging to the Romane Catholiques through the land are at their command, from whence they haue all such collections as they can require gathered to their hand, as well from thence as from all the Libraries of both Vniuersities, and even the bookes themselues if that be requisite.

"Besides I have made it a principall part of my imployment, to buy all the manuscripts and other ancient and rare Authours out of the hands of the Heretiques, so that there is no great Scholler dies in the land, but my Agents are dealing with his bookes. In so much as even their learned Isaack Causabon's Library was in election without question to be ours, had not their vigilant King (who forsees all dangers, and hath his eye busie in euery place) prevented my plot. For after the death of that great scholler, I

sent to request a view and catalogue of his bookes with their price, intending not to be out-vyed by any man, if money would fetch them; because (besides the damage that side should haue receiued by their losse, prosecuting the same story against Cardinall Baronius) we might haue made good aduantage of his notes, collections, castigations, censures and criticismes for our owne party, and framed and put out others vnder his name at our pleasure. But this was fore-seene by their Prometheus, who sent that Torturer of ours (the Bishop of Winchester) to search and sort the papers, and to seale vp the study: Giuing a large and princely allowance for them to the Relicks of Causabon, together with a bountifull pension and provision for her and hers. But this plot fayling at that time hath not euer done so. Nor had the Vniuersitie of Oxford so triumphed in their many manuscripts giuen by that famous Knight S. Thomas Bodley, if either I had been then employed, or this course of mine then thought vpon; for I would labour what I might this way or any other way to disarme them, and either to translate their best authours hither, or at least to leaue non in the hands of any but Romane Catholiques who are assuredly ours. And to this end an especiall eye would be had vpon the Library of one S. Robert Cotton (an ingrosser of Antiquities) that whensoever it come to be broken vp (eyther before his death or after) the most choice and singular pieces might be gleaned and gathered up, by a Catholique hand. Neyther let any man thinke, that descending thus low to pettie particulars is vnworthy an Ambassadour, or of small auayle for the ends we ayme at, since we see every mountayne consists of severall sands; and there is no more profitable conuersing for Statesmen then amogst schollers and their books, specially where the King for whom we watch is the King of Schollers,

aud loves to liue almost altogether in their element. Besides if by any means we can continue differences in their Church, or make them wider, or beget distaste betwist their Clergy and common Lawyer, who are men of greatest power in the land, the benefit will be ours, the consequences great, opening a way for vs to come in betweene, for personall quarels produce reall questions."

The late Major Martin Hume told the writer that he was convinced that in the official archives of the Spanish Court there was a great quantity of manuscripts and books stored away which, if access could be obtained to them, would throw considerable light not only upon the political events of the Elizabethan period, but also upon the literary problems of the time. The foregoing extract is confirmatory of this view. There is no knowing what literary treasures may by the skilful manipulation of Gondomar have found their way to the Spanish Court.

It is not quite clear whether "their Prometheus" is intended to refer to James, who is probably described as "their vigilant King (who forsees all dangers and hath his eye busy in every place)." At the time of Casaubon's death, which occurred in 1614, Bacon was Attorney-General and wielded great influence. It is not an extravagant suggestion to make that it was he who is designated "their Prometheus."

Casaubon was born in Geneva in 1599, and came to England in 1610 on the invitation of the Archbishop of Canterbury. In January, 1611, unsolicited, James settled on him a pension of £300 per annum, and Casaubon took out letters of naturalisation. The King was fascinated by the conversational powers of one whose memory was an inexhaustible store of book learning. Casaubon did not speak English, but the conversations were conducted in French, which James spoke fluently.

In 1609 Casaubon had read Bacon's "*De Sapientia Veterum*," and in a letter written from France to Sir George Carew had praised its originality. Bacon had seen this letter and was desirous of enlisting Casaubon's interest in the "Great Instauration." He wrote a letter to Casaubon, the draft of which remains, but the letter appears not to have been sent. There is no trace of any intercourse between the two men. As both were habitués of the Court, they must, however, frequently have met.

Casaubon devoted himself to the episcopal pamphlet warfare—a controversy which Bacon regarded with distaste.

Casaubon had great difficulty in getting his books over from France. The Queen Regent refused permission for his library to be sent to him. His wife returned to Paris to plead for them. A third part only were then obtained, and these not the most useful books, the Queen Regent saying, "We must retain some lien upon our subject." In his will he left to the French Church in London "four of his greatest books amonge the fathers," and his Gregory Nyssen Manuscript, and to his nephew, Mr. Chabane, one of his Hippocrates. The remainder appear to have been acquired by the Crown, though it is difficult to trace where they are now located.

The Bodley and Cotton treasures are safe, but the speech would not have been put into Gondomar's mouth if there had not been good grounds for believing that he was purchasing and transferring to Spain valuable books and manuscripts.

The present relations between the reigning houses of England and Spain might, if public interest in the subject could be created, lead to a search being made through the Spanish archives.

A FEW NOTES ON *LOVE'S LABOUR'S LOST.*

MR. STRONACH (BACONIANA, p. 82, 1908) has shown that the Spanish traveller, Don Adriano Armado, in *Love's Labour's Lost*, was Philip the Second's exiled minister, Antonio Perez. Martin Hume, in his "Spanish Influence on English Literature," (London, 1905), p. 61, says he (Perez) "wrote his books and letters in his extravagantly affected style at Essex House, Strand, and in Paris," and describes his "affected wit and preciosity, as well as his sententious philosophy," and how "all the young bloods . . . sought to imitate the quips and obscurities of 'Master Antonio,' whose affected manners they laughed at" (p. 243). On p. 257 Hume says, "Shakespeare had more than the fashionable smattering of a few phrases in Spanish; it is curious to see how frequently he introduces such phrases into his plays," and alludes to Pistol being a burlesque of a Spanish swashbuckler, and adds (p. 258), "but to my mind, at least, another character in Shakespeare bears signs not only of being a caricature upon the heroic pretensions, the chivalrous pose, and the extravagant language, which were supposed to mark Spaniards in general, but of being intended for a burlesque upon a particular person—I mean the character of the Spaniard, Don Adriano Armado, in *Love's Labour's Lost*." "As far as I know," he says, "my theory is a new one. . . . I mean Antonio Perez, the exiled Secretary of State. *Love's Labour's Lost* cannot originally have been written later than 1591, and Perez did not escape from Spain into France until November of that year." Hume thinks the points mentioned were introduced into the play when "partially re-written for a Court performance in 1597."

Perez arrived in England in the autumn of 1593. Hume says, "By all he was laughed at for his affectation and envied for his malicious wit," and further tells us, "Lady Bacon was violently angry that her son Francis should be so friendly with him, 'a proud, profane, costly fellow, whose being about him, I verily believe, the Lord God doth mislike.'" Hume says that "one of Anthony Bacon's agents writes of him in 1594, 'Surely he is, as we say, an odd man, and hath his full sight everywhere.'" If we turn to the play we shall find the Princess of France's view of the Don agrees with Anne, Lady Bacon's view of Perez. In Act V. sc. ii. the Princess asks Biron, "Doth this man serve God?" adding, "He speaks not like a man of God's making." Holofernes' description of the Don is given in actually the same words as those used by Anthony Bacon's agent, "Too *odd*, as it were, too peregrinate, as I may call it" (Act V. sc. i.). Hume says much more about Perez. "In 1596 he disgusted and offended the Earl (Essex) and thenceforward his star in England had set." Then he adds, "So that if we assume that the special touches of caricature that identify Don Adriano Armado with Perez were introduced into the play when it was re-cast for the Court performance in 1597, the reason for the skit upon Essex's fallen favourite becomes at once apparent. The Court, and the Court only, would see the joke, which no one would have dared to make when Perez was in favour three years before, for then Perez would have struck back with the sharp claws beneath his velvet paw." Another sign to us Baconians how dangerous it was for Bacon to acknowledge his plays or make himself known as the dramatist who satirised living people. "No one can read," says Hume, "Perez's many published letters and *Relaciones* without identifying numerous affected turns of speech with those put into

the mouth of Don Adriano Armado. And the description given of Don Adriano Armado by the King of Navarre in the play tallies exactly with the word portraits remaining to us of Antonio Perez drawn from his own writings and those of his contemporaries." Hume says (p. 273), "Perez gave himself many nicknames, one favourite being '*Peregrino*,' '*El Peregrino*,' or '*Rafael Peregrino*,'"* and that "he signed himself thus." Hume adds, "Peregrinate is, and always has been, an extremely rarely used English word, so that its introduction by Shake-speare especially applied to Don Adriano Armado is significant." Then he quotes Sir Nathaniel and Holofernes on the Don (Act V. sc. i.), where it is stated Don Adriano is "a companion of the King of Navarre." Henry IV., King of Navarre, Hume says, "treated him (Perez) with almost royal honour," and "would hardly let him out of his sight." Hume points out that the Don's account of the king's familiarity with him may very well be "a burlesque of Henry's affection for him" (Perez) which "would not be displeasing to Shakespeare's patron (Essex) at the time," who, again, "had been deeply offended by the ingratitude of Perez in preferring to remain in France." The expressions "ambitious and majestical" in Holofernes' speech to me are very significant, for Perez seems to have laid claim to royal parentage. Essex's sister, Lady Rich, had a taste of his quality. Hume tells us of a letter he wrote her, with a present of some dog-skin gloves. Hume says, "Perez, for two or three pages, continues to ring the wearisome changes upon dogs and skins and souls in a way that Don Adriano Armado himself could not have bettered," and Lady Rich, as I find in Dr. Birch's "Memoirs of the Reign of Queen Elizabeth" (p. 475) in a letter to Mr. Bacon,

* Bacon quoted by Johnson and Webster for Peregrine and Perigrination.

says, "I would fain hear what becomes of your wandering neighbour." A further witness—if one is needed—to the identity of the Peregrinate one. Francis Bacon's familiar acquaintance with the Spanish language can readily be seen in his "Promus," where he quotes no less than forty Spanish proverbs.

Spanish comes trippingly on his pen, too, in letters, when, for example, he writes to Secretary Cecil (1602), "As the Spaniard well says: *Desario con la calentura*," or, again, to Tobie Mathew (1621), "*Amor sin fin no tiene fin*," quoting Gondemar.

We know from his "Essay of Travel" he would not have visited Spain without knowing Spanish, or else he would have been as one who "goeth to school and not to travel." That he was a traveller in Spain we learn from the biography in the early French edition of "*La Vie Naturelle*," in the body of which work we find yet another indication of the same fact. "Honey," says observant Francis, "in Spain smelleth of the rosemary or orange from whence the bee gathereth it."

With regard to the Princess of France in *Love's Labour's Lost*, is she Marguerite of Valois, daughter of Henry II. and Catherine de Medicis? In 1591, when the play was written, Henry the Bearnais was King of France, and had just defeated the League at Ivry. But the date of the play itself may be that of the dissolute Valois reign, when a certain few scholarly young courtiers may have actually withdrawn from the temptations of the world, the flesh, and the devil, for a time for the purpose of self-culture, while the sudden appearance of the beautiful and fascinating Margot in their midst, accompanied by her by no means too particular maids of honour, may well have put the plans of the ascetic brotherhood to flight. De Thou, in his "*Collection complète des Memoires relatifs a l'Histoire de France*," says that at fifteen Margot came to Court the

idol of her maids of honour, that she cultivated charms of mind, was the leader of fashion, and took the most prominent part in the more grave and majestic dances of her day. I was surprised to find from Brantôme that this remarkable Princess of France was a dark lady, inheriting her locks "*fort noir*" from her father, Henry II., for her portraits represent her as fair. This, it appears, is owing to the fair *crispé* wigs she often wore, and always carried about with her when travelling. In the light of this, the many allusions to fair and dark ladies in the play become pointed. When Biron rhapsodises about his dark lady, the King upholds his fair princess, who, Biron assures him, dare not face the rain for fear her colour should be washed away—a home-thrust when we know the perfumed, gilded lily Margot painted an inch thick. Biron makes another good point when he adds :

"Devils soonest tempt, resembling spirits of light.

O, if in black my lady's brows be decked,

It mourns that painting and usurping hair,

Should ravish doters with a false aspect."

Moth amuses the company vastly when he connects the angel princess with a devil, but in so doing he ventures all too near the truth, if Don John of Austria is to be believed.

Brantôme, in his "*Mémoires of Marguerite*," says Don John attended a ball at the Louvre disguised on purpose to see Margot, and said, in Spanish, "How much more is that queen's beauty for the perdition and damnation of men than for their salvation."

This princess's attraction was certainly phenomenal, though she had good haters among the Protestants and Catholics both. Hers is a dramatic and majestic character, standing out as she does in history with her well-developed figure robed in cloth of silver, or in orange

and black, or in blood-red Spanish velvet and cap to match, and all her plumes and jewels. Beautiful and accomplished Margot, conversing easily and spontaneously with envoys and ambassadors in elegant Latin, singing her own stanzas to her lute, was as inconstant as that moon which her lover in the play compares her to—a dangerous planet for our young, impressionable, and amiable poet Francis of sixteen, to approach in brilliant Paris. How should he, of all others, escape the fatal fascinations of this "*Venus Uranie*," sung by all the poets of her time, Ronsard included? Bitter-sweet recollections of Margot in that, his "green goose" stage, may well have inspired Francis after fourteen years had passed, to immortalise so great a lady, especially one who may have, even to his cost, proved to him what Biron says: that

"Love first learned in a lady's eyes
Lives not immured in the brain ;
But with the motion of the all elements,
Courses as swift as thought in every power ;
And gives to every power a double power
Above their functions and their offices.
It adds a precious seeing to the eye."

Just because of his "green goose idolatry" during the time he was the youthful envoy of the "Arbitress of Nations," Elizabeth, in Paris, did he wish to paint her picture in this play of his, destined to live as long as the world lasts?

Even Margot had her good points. She was "extraordinarily charitable," and to the Forester her hand is a giving one in the play, where she pointedly says, "A giving hand though foul shall have fair praise." It is not a touch without purpose, that of our dramatist, when he places his Princess shooting with her bow at a deer in a park, for stag hunting was a favourite pastime of Reine Margot at Fontainebleau.

Mrs. Chambers Bunten's valuable researches have brought to light Anthony Bacon's passport, dated 1586, signed by Monsieur de Biron, Marshal of France and Lieutenant-General for King Henry IV., at whose Court Anthony Bacon resided for some time. In examining the long chain of evidence, growing longer every day, the many links provided by *Love's Labour's Lost* must not be overlooked.

ALICIA AMY LEITH.

CONTROVERSY TO THE FORE.

BACONIANS cannot complain that their pet subject has been excluded from the press during the past two months. The publication of Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence's book, "Bacon is Shakespeare," was well timed. Parliament was not sitting; even the Crippen case and deaths of aviators failed to supply adequate copy for the dailies, and the correspondence columns were opened for discussion on the authorship of the Shakespeare plays with a liberality on the part of sub-editors which has not been experienced for many years. Sir Edwin's book was widely circulated for the purpose of review, and there are few newspapers in which comment upon it has not been made. Most of these have been adverse. That was to be expected. A careful perusal of the notices which have appeared would justify the assertion that not one reviewer out of ten had read the book through. Seldom has there been a case which reveals in stronger light the slovenly manner in which reviews of books are written. The writers blundered, misunderstood, and misrepresented in the most pitiable manner. But the fact remains that public attention has been directed to the subject.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* has devoted more space than any other paper, but most of the letters have been directed to side issues, and the real merits of the arguments both for and against the Baconian theory have seldom been urged. The *Observer* (18th October) gave a column and a-half to the consideration of the question, "Is there a case for investigation?" and the editor, whilst closing the correspondence in the issue of the following week, courteously supplied the writer of that article with proofs of the letters which were to be inserted, so that his reply might appear. The *Manchester City News* has also shown a sympathetic tolerance to the controversy.

Mrs. Nesbit Bland, the distinguished authoress, in a letter which appeared in one of the weeklies, made an excellent suggestion, namely, that a committee, to consist of "three Baconians, three Shakespeareans, and three common-sense individuals with no personal axe to grind," should be formed, which should consider the literary and historical evidence, pro and con. Mrs. Nesbit Bland goes on to say:—"If the Baconian theory is rotten, let it be shattered and swept away. If it is not rotten, let it be placed in the ranks of serious controversy and set in a position where it would be free from that species of attack which takes the form of personal abuse of the opponent. I challenge the Shakespeareans to provide three men to serve on that committee of investigation. And I know they won't take up the challenge, because they have been challenged again and again, and the answer always is 'No, thank you; we know we are right, and we aren't going to discuss the matter.' How fine a position would be that of the men who should seriously look into this business without prejudice, without rancour, and get the matter settled one way or the other."

Mrs. Nesbit's letter brought a rejoinder from Mr.

Haldane Macfall, in which the following examples of that gentleman's literary culture occur, and are applied to his opponents: "Artistic ignorance of Baconians is only surpassed by their aggressive effrontery"; "Baconian drivel"; "vilely illiterate"; "not demand serious consideration for their effrontery"; "a fool's trial"; "fantastic and stupid slanders." Mr. Macfall based his argument upon the difference in literary style between the essays of Bacon and the dramas of Shakespeare being conclusive that the essays and dramas could not have been written by the same man.*

The following extract from Mrs. Nesbit's reply appears to be a conclusive answer to the argument based on the difference of literary style.

There is you know a great deal of rubbish talked about the critical faculty, and the critics do not know nearly so much about literature or music as they pretend to do. There are certain passages of Beethoven which even Mr. Macfall, even if he had never heard them before, would attribute to Mozart; others which he would attribute to Haydn. And when an old master turns up without a signature, there does not fail of hot discussion

* Some of the most eminent Shakespeareans who wrote before the controversy was started and, therefore, wrote impartially, held other opinions. Dr. Nathan Drake, in "Shakespeare and His Times," 1817, Vol. I, page 17, writes: "It can be no difficult task to conceive the delight and the mental profit which a genius such as Shakespeare's, of which one characteristic is its fertility in aphoristic precept, must have derived from the study of Lord Bacon's Essays. The apothegmatic treasures of Shakespeare have lately been condensed into a single volume by the judgment and industry of Mr. Lofft, and it may be safely affirmed that no uninspired works, either in our own or any other language, can be produced, however bulky or voluminous, which contain a richer mine of perceptive wisdom than may be found in these two books of the philosopher and the poet, the "Essays" of Bacon and the "Aphorisms" of Shakespeare. Alexander Smith wrote: "He seems to have written his essays with the pen of Shakespeare."

as to whether it be the work of Velasquez or another. In literature, well, what about Mr. William Sharp and Fiona Macleod? Would any of us have guessed—did any of us guess—from Mr. Sharp's journalistic prose that he wrote these poems? Why does not Mr. Macfall say, "I have read some essays by William Sharp. He couldn't have written and didn't write the poems of Fiona Macleod"? One pictures him saying it and supporting it, not by argument, but by dogma. As thus: "You could not deceive me." Mr. Macfall would say, warmly, "You could not deceive me, for instance, with the pen line of Beardsley as being the pen line of Phil May, which are much nearer of a likeness than the art of Shakespeare and the art of Bacon. Now take myself," Mr. Macfall would modestly continue; "I know William Sharp's newspaper articles, or rather did know them, by heart. I have had a life-long delight in them. I have, as probably most creative writers have, an intense artistic sensing of the literary art in Fiona Macleod. I know the artistry of these artists so intimately that I could not possibly be mistaken." Thus Mr. Macfall might have said; and yet, you know, he would have been mistaken. But you will say Mr. Macfall would have been rash in coming to the conclusion, after reading no work of Mr. Sharp's save his newspaper articles, that Mr. Sharp could not have written the poems of Fiona Macleod. And if you do say it you are quite right. He would have been rash, but no rasher than he is when he pretends to judge of the capacity of Francis Bacon by one work—the most condensed and least ornate of the works of that great man.

Mr. Frederick H. Evans, alluding to the above, writes: "Mrs. E. Nesbit's parallel of 'Fiona Macleod' is a cute one, as I am sure the most critical and sensitive of us would have scouted the idea of the real authorship. May I suggest a further parallel? I am sure my friend Haldane Macfall's knowledge of Fitzgerald's writings is complete and adequate; but let us suppose that Fitzgerald's 'Letters' had no reference to Persian studies, and that Mr. Macfall had never seen the Omar versions. If a copy of this Omar, with no name to it, were given to him and he be asked to declare its authorship, would he be the least likely to father it on

Fitzgerald from his knowledge of Fitzgerald's letters, Spanish translations, &c. ? ”

The reply of Mr. Macfall is of such high literary merit, and is an example of refinement, magnanimity and chivalric courtesy so seldom met with in controversy, that it is necessary to reproduce it *in extenso* :

“SIR,—Mrs. Nesbit's personal attack on me leaves me defenceless. To attack a friend, surely that were impossible! To attack a woman, still more impossible. And when, as here, both are one, I am disarmed. Before her contempt I must, therefore, bow; her belittling of my powers I must live down—I had not suspected my so utter unworthiness.

“Indeed, if Bacon must screen his claim to Shakespeare's bays behind her pretty petticoats, rather than strike at her, I will even admit that perhaps Shakespeare's plays were written by another fellow of the same name. Therefore, I retract. Let Mrs. Nesbit empanel her jury and put Shakespeare to trial. The jury? God knows. Who will accept the finding? God alone knows.

HALDANE MACFALL.”

One of the most sagacious comments which has appeared was made by a reviewer in the *Nottingham Express* (24th September). He said: “One thing is conclusively revealed by this book. If Bacon is Shakespeare, then Bacon proved himself to be a far greater genius in the way in which he has hidden his identity than in anything which appears under the name of William Shakespeare.” Had the writer been reading the “*Epigrammatum*” of John Owen? The first edition bears date 1607, and others followed in 1612, 1618, and 1633—all in the Latin tongue. An English translation appeared in 1677 by Thomas Harvey. The edition now quoted from is dated 1628, and was issued by the Elzevir firm. No. 35 of Book II. is addressed Ad D.B.

This is believed to be a contraction for Ad Dominum Baconum. It is as follows :—

“ Si bene qui latuit, bene vixit, tu bene vivis :
Ingeniumque tuum grande latendo patet.”

Harvey renders this in English :—

“ Thou livest well, if one well hid, well lives :
And thy great wit concealed, more splendour gives.”

A literal translation is even more expressive :—“And thy great genius is revealed in being concealed.” What great genius or wit was living in the early days of the seventeenth century to whom this tribute could be applied? Certainly on the Baconian theory it would be difficult to find words which more accurately describe Francis Bacon.

Mr. Andrew Lang writes in the *Morning Post*, under the headline “*The Bacon-Shakespeare Mare’s Nest.*” He is scornful and intolerant and, as is his custom, seeks to make his points with ridicule instead of argument. But he leaves the issue where he found it. His effusion does not make the Stratford case appear one whit stronger or the Bacon case one iota weaker. The *Westminster Gazette* reviewer thus summarises the position of the heretics :—“Incapable of conceiving the genius of the ‘myriad-minded’ poet, Shakespeare, they are forced to double the miracle by tacking on the not unconsiderable achievements of Bacon, and then swallow without effort the absurd formula, Shakespeare + Bacon = the one and indivisible Bakespear or Shacon, as you will.” The pun is feeble enough, but the attempt at a scientific statement of the proposition is feebler. Coleridge said :—“What! are we to have miracles in sport? . . . Does God choose idiots by whom to convey divine truth to man?” Coleridge, then, could not conceive the miracle of Shakspeare possessing the genius of the

"myriad-minded" poet, and Coleridge was no Baconian. As to doubling the miracle, the oft but too seldom quoted words of Shelley, no Baconian, may be cited:—"Lord Bacon was a poet. His language has a sweet and majestic rhythm which satisfies the sense no less than the almost superhuman wisdom of his philosophy satisfies the intellect. It is a strain which distends, and then bursts the circumference of the reader's mind, and pours itself forth with it into the universal element with which it has perpetual sympathy. Plato exhibits the rare union of close and subtle logic with the Pythian enthusiasm of poetry, melted by the splendour and harmony of his periods, which hurry the persuasion onward as in a breathless career. Lord Bacon is, perhaps, the only writer who, in these particulars, can be compared with him." Shelley was, if we except the author Shakespeare, supreme as a master of poetry, and his judgment cannot be heedlessly ignored. Now how can the formula be accurately set out without the assistance of a hackneyed pun? Shakspeare—Bacon = a miracle. Bacon + Shake-speare – Shakspeare = the unknown author.

The prominence given in the Press to this subject has done good service. It reveals the fact that the heretics are numerous and capable controversialists. Dr. R. M. Theobald, the Nestor of the movement, Mr. George Hookham, Mr. S. Waddington, Mr. Croutch Batchelor, Mrs. Nesbit, Mr. E. Wake Cook, Mr. Horace Nickson, Mr. S. B. Eckett, Mrs. H. H. Stewart, Mr. A. L. Francis, and others who have taken part, have come out of the discussion with flying colours. Anyone would expect to find such an opinion as this expressed in these columns, but if any impartial reader would wade through the correspondence a similar view would be the result. The day is rapidly approaching when other and conclusive evidence will be forthcoming. If

Bacon was the author of the Shakespeare poems and plays he knew their value. If he was the author of the Sonnets he wrote—

"'Gainst death and all-oblivious enmity
Shall you pace forth ; your praise shall still find room,
Even in the eyes of all posterity,
That wear this world out to the ending doom."

The author held not in high esteem the opinion of his contemporaries; he staked all on the opinion of the ages yet to come. Again and again he makes this clear. Bacon took infinite pains in everything he did. He was no journeyman, but a thorough workman. Having sowed the seed he was prepared to wait until in the fulness of time he should reap his harvest of fame. He was a seer. He knew the time must come when his wealth, which was in names, would be searched for with a determination and a heroism which only the fascination of his great character and intellect could inspire. But he took no risks and he left nothing to chance. The more the hypothesis is considered the more inevitable does it become that Francis Bacon left behind him complete and incontestable evidence of his claims to fame, and that the day cannot be far distant when that evidence will be forthcoming—evidence which will effectually vindicate his character and establish for all time his right to be called "the wisest, greatest of mankind."

MR. TANNER'S DISCOVERY.

DATA upon which the public will be able to form an opinion as to the value of Mr. Tanner's discovery will be published before the end of the year. During the last few months the work has been submitted to men eminent in law, literature and science, and not one of them has been able to in any degree destroy its importance. Practically the only criticism is that it is too wonderful for belief—that it is difficult to believe that the human intellect ever existed that was capable of such a marvellous feat. But there it is. As to the fact there can be no question. If the feat was not accomplished by the man who constructed the lines To the Reader, prefixed to the 1623 folio edition of the plays, then Mr. Tanner must have the credit. But that increases the marvel a thousand times, for whereas the writer of the doggrel had leeway to alter a word here or a letter there to fall in with his scheme, Mr. Tanner has no latitude. The words are printed and he cannot alter them.

So that the student may not be overcome by a multiplicity of examples a selection only of those which are most important will in the first instance be published. The book will be 8vo royal and consist of about 160 pages with twelve folding plates. The price will be three shillings and sixpence. This will be in the hands of the booksellers before Christmas. Then early in the year the larger volume will be issued.

The editor of the *Manchester City News*, Mr. Cuming Walters, has undertaken the formation of a committee in that city to examine and report on certain definite claims made in a letter addressed to him by Mr. W. T. Smedley. These claims are as follows :—

1. That the lines "To the Reader," signed "B. I.,"

prefixed to the folio edition, 1623, of the Shake-speare plays represent a scale or table of numbers.

2. That the remarkable relations arising therefrom between the names "William Shake-speare" and "Francis Bacon" justify the assertion that the former was a pseudonym of the latter; and that the name "Ben Jonson" is also connected with such scale or table.

3. That the year 1623 was specially chosen as the date of the issue of the first folio on account of the peculiar properties of the figures constituting it.

4. That the Droeshout Engraving represents a Mask, and is not intended to portray the face of the true author.

5. That many, if not all, the mispaginations contained in the folio edition are intentional, and are in direct correspondence to the said scale of numbers.

Mr. Cuming Walters is himself a distinguished student and is chairman of the Manchester Shakespeare Society. He is the author of a volume published in 1899 by the New Century Press, entitled "The Mystery of Shakespeare's Sonnets." No more sagacious book has been written on the subject, and if the author has missed the whole truth of the Sonnets it is only because he did not spell the word Shakespeare with the letters B A C O N. Mr. Walters is taking steps to get together a thoroughly representative committee, which will not include any men with strong Baconian sympathies. It is intended that the examination shall take place so that the report of the Committee may be issued prior to the publication of the book.

NOTES.

MR. G. G. GREENWOOD, M.P., is placing Baconians under a further obligation to him by publishing in book form his reply to the articles which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* from the pens of Sir Edward Sullivan, Bart., and the Rev. Canon Beeching, and to other critics. The book will embody, but in a greatly amplified form, the article which Mr. Greenwood contributed to that magazine in June, 1909, under the title of "The Vindicators of Shakespeare," and an article to which the editor refused publication dealing with Sir Edward Sullivan's reply thereto and with Canon Beeching's criticisms thereon. It will, further, contain the article on Dr. Wallace's "New Shakespeare Discoveries" which Mr. Greenwood contributed to the *National Review* of April last, and a chapter entitled "A Typical Stratfordian Essay," based on Miss Rose Kingsley's article, "Shakespeare in Warwickshire," which appeared in the *Nineteenth Century* of May last. It is not necessary here to draw attention to Mr. Greenwood's ability as a controversialist. His perspicacity of mind and incisive literary style enable him to place the points at issue before the reader in a manner which enables the subject to be grasped without effort. The author remains an agnostic as to the Bacon authorship. He contents himself with demolishing most effectually the claims of the "Stratford rustic." If Mr. Greenwood alights at Willesden instead of coming through with Baconians to Euston they are glad to have his company so far as his journey takes him. The book will be published (8vo., 210 pages) at a price of half-a-crown net, and will be issued during the month of November. It may be obtained from the Secretary of the Bacon Society.

Without expressing any opinion as to whether Bacon made use of cyphers to leave on record information either as to his own work or incidents of the times in which he lived, attention may be drawn to the fact that at a much more recent period John Wesley kept his diary in cypher and committed to cypher some of his most private personal thoughts. At first his diary was kept from day to day, but as years passed it was kept every hour of the day, from four o'clock in the morning to ten o'clock at night. The first of the diaries was in the possession of Mr. George Stamp, of Grimsby, a well-known collector of Wesleyan manuscripts and curiosities. Other portions are in the possession of the Colman family of Norwich. These were lent to the Rev. Nehemiah Curnock, who has laboured for years on the discovery and elucidation of these documents. They are written in paper in duodecimo books, which contain about 200 pages bound in calf and covering the whole period from 1729 to 1742. The elucidation of the documents was a work of great difficulty. They are written in three different ways :

- (a) A most extraordinary and highly complex cypher, the key to which Mr. Curnock said suddenly came to him in a dream one night.
- (2) An abbreviated longhand, a word being represented by a single letter or two letters.
- (3) A system of shorthand invented by John Byrom (the author of "Christians, Awake, Salute the Happy Morn"), of which Wesley was a master.

Mr. Curnock first mastered Byrom's system of shorthand, but this did not give him every key to the cypher. As he progressed he found that one vowel was the key to all the vowels, and one consonant the key to all the consonants. The cypher consisted of arbitrary signs; the same signs did not always mean the same

letter. Then at last the missing letter came to him in a dream. He discovered that a frequently recurring sign, namely '∴,' meant and could only mean 12; but this, it is explained, proved useless as a clue until in his dream, after nights of thinking and racking of brains, he found that the figure 2 stood for "a."

These diaries have supplied dates and names of persons who were Wesley's intimate friends. Entries therein have led to the discovery of material in the Colonial and Record Offices, where facilities have been granted for the study of large stores of original documents relating to the Georgia Trust. The first two volumes on Mr. Curnock's work have so far only been published, and there are three more volumes to follow at intervals of six months each.

M. Jusserand, in his excellent volume on "Shakespeare in France," recounts that in 1645 Jean Blaeu published the fourth part of the "Théâtre du Monde." In it all countries and towns are described. Stratford-on-Avon is not omitted, and the reference to it is in words of which the following is a translation:—

"The Avone . . . passes against Stratford, a rather agreeable little trading place, but which owes all its glory to two of its nurslings: to wit, John de Stratford, Archbishop of Canterbury, who built a temple there, and Hugh de Clopton, judge at London, who threw across the Avone, at great cost, a bridge of fourteen arches."

Notwithstanding Jonson's eulogy on the sweet swan of Avon, and Leonard Digge's confidence that the author would still be viewed, though time dissolved his Stratford manument, twenty-two years after the issue of the first folio edition of the plays an account of Stratford was written for what M. Jusserand designates "a

magnificent work in folio printed in Amsterdam," which contains not one word about the man on whose worth it depends for its sole claim to fame.

A correspondent drew attention to the opening sentence of the dedication, signed D. M. and addressed "A Monseigneur de Chasteau-neuf, Garde des seaux de France," prefixed to "L'Histoire Naturelle de Mr. Francois Bacon," published in Paris in 1631.* It reads thus: "Ce Chancelier qu'on a fait venir tant de fois en France, n'a point encore quitté l'Angleterre avec tant de passion de nous découvrir ses merveilles que depuis qu'il a sceu le rang dont on avoit reconnu vos vertus." It is clear that this refers to Bacon's frequent personal visits to France.

It is to the credit of Newfoundland, the oldest British Dominion, that in celebrating the tercentenary of the first permanent settlement in the country, her rulers have recognized the great assistance rendered by Francis Bacon in the establishment of the British Colonies. A series of eleven postage stamps has been issued as one of the means chosen to make the occasion memorable. That for six cents has on it the head of Lord Bacon as the guiding spirit in the first colonization of Newfoundland. This is a subject upon which the biographers have proved themselves sadly deficient.

There is now published from Chicago a monthly magazine under the title of "Universal Masonry." The first number appeared in July. The second number deals principally with Francis Bacon and his connection with the craft. Mrs. M. C. Holbrook is the Editor. The annual subscription is 2 dols.; single copies are sold at 20 cents.

* BACONIANA, Vol. VIII., third series, page 120.

CORRESPONDENCE.

English Dramatists of 16th Century.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

SIR,—I think the following list might be of interest to some of your readers:—

		<i>Born.</i>	
Thos. Norton, M.P.	...	1532	} Together wrote first English Tragedy.
The Earl of Dorset	...	1536	
George Gascoigne	...	1536	Son of Sir John Gascoigne.
John Still	...	1543	Bishop of Bath and Wells.
John Lyly, M.P.	...	1554	B.A., Oxford.
Anthony Munday	...	1556	In Rome when 22 years of age—1578.
Thos. Kyd	...	1557	Son of a lawyer.
G. Peele	...	1558	B.A., Oxford.
G. Chapman	...	1559	B.A., Oxford.
R. Greene	...	1560	B.A., Cambridge.
Christopher Marlowe	...	1564	B.A., Cambridge.
W. Shakespere	...	1564	A butcher and actor.
Thos. Nash	...	1567	B.A., Cambridge.
Thos. Middleton	...	1570	Of Gray's Inn (Lord Bacon's Inn).
Ben Jonson	...	1573	B.A., Cambridge.
J. Marston	...	1575	B.A., Brasenose Coll., Oxford.
T. Heywood	...	1575	B.A., Cambridge.
J. Ford	...	1584	Oxford and Middle Temple.
Beaumont	...	1586	Oxford (son of Sir John Beaumont).
Fletcher	...	1576	Cambridge (son of Bishop of London).
Massinger	...	1583	B.A., Oxford.
J. Webster	...	1579	
T. Dekker	...	1580(?)	

SAMUEL WADDINGTON.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—The following is an extract which I received from a correspondent in New South Wales:—

"In your interesting contribution to the April number of BACONIANA there is a quotation from 'Things New and Old.' The passage begins 'When children meet with primroses.' That paragraph, with certain alterations and additions, occurs in 'Spare Minutes,' by Arthur Warwick. The little work seemed so full of Baconian and Shakesperean echoes that I was tempted,

when in London three years ago, to spend an afternoon in the Museum looking at as many of the editions as I could find. The search was not successful in getting further than the third, dated 1636. The 1627 edition is a beautifully bound 12mo volume, containing the book-plate of I forget what Countess. It is kept in one of the exhibition cases.

"What struck me most was the alteration in the emblematical frontispieces of the 1640 edition as compared with the earlier editions. In the latter the pictures are much more elaborate. There are also Latin verses by Quarles, which do not appear in the 1640 edition."

Arthur Warwick is, without doubt, another *nom de plume* of Francis Bacon. "Spare Minutes" is a valuable addition to our author's works. I give you the passage about primroses:—

"When children meet with primroses, nuts, or apples in their way, I see those pleasures are oft-times occasions to make them loiter in their errands; so that they are sure to have their parents' displeasure; and oft-times their late return finds a barred entrance to their home" ("Spare Minutes," by Arthur Warwick, p. 182, Reeves and Turner's edition, 1890).

Further light on the primrose question is found on p. 211, where Warwick alludes to "our age's winter" and "as to the primroses of our youth's spring."

Yours faithfully,

ALICIA A. LEITH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

DEAR SIR,—I was surprised to read your strictures upon Dr. Appleton Morgan in your April issue.

Perhaps Dr. Morgan rejects the "ciphers" for the same reason that he accepts the Bacon authorship theory—that is to say, because he is a lawyer and a student of evidence. Don't let us forget Dr. Morgan's immense services to the Baconion propositus. When "The Shakespeare Myth" appeared in 1877 there was no text-book on the subject except Judge Holmes's ponderous volume, which had dropped stillborn from the press because it was almost as recondite and unreadable—not to say as unintelligible—as poor Delia Bacon's "Philosophy of Shakespeare's Plays Unfolded," which Hawthorne said that nobody ever read (Judge Holmes's book, as a matter of fact, has been dropped from the catalogue of its publishers, Messrs. Houghton, Mifflin, and Company), and except a pamphlet or a newspaper article now and then, the question was unknown.

Dr. Wyman's "Bibliography," with all his research, counting every allusion that could be forced that way, could enumerate less than thirty prior to that date. Dr. Morgan's book popularised the subject. Here in America, at least, newspapers and

magazines began to discuss it, and it became a favourite theme in college and literary clubs for amateur debates.

"The Shakespearean Myth" went through four editions—a record no work upon the Baconian theory has ever approached. It practically introduced the Bacon theory into Germany in the German translation of Dr. Karl Muller-Mylne, and although President of the New York Shakespeare Society, Dr. Morgan has always been a loyal Baconian, and even in that "orthodox" society, has never failed to preserve his loyalty to Bacon, and to insist upon a like loyalty in others. I think we Baconians cannot afford to lose Dr. Morgan. Our propaganda has been hard hit lately by the Button Moulder. Bompas, Begley, William Theobald, Judge Webb, Lord Penzance, W. H. Edwards, Judge Holmes, Edwin Reed, Judge Stotsenburg—all these have joined the majority.

None of these, no more than White, Castle, or Greenwood—who, I believe, are still living—were "cipherists." Is it policy to read out of our Guild the few wheel-horses we have left because they happen to be of the old faith?

So far as I can see, the question the cipherists ask is not "Did Bacon write the plays?" but "Did Bacon claim the plays?" It seems to me that the first of the above questions is the only one in which—if in either—the world is interested to the slightest degree.

And permit me to call your attention to the fact that the recent discoveries of Dr. Wallace in your Public Records are a remarkable confirmation of Dr. Morgan's conjecture in "The Shakespearean Myth" that William Shakespeare was the owner, by purchase, and stage-mounter of the plays. Certainly nobody who ever read that work can deny that this was the "new" or "editorial" or "compromise" theory that Dr. Morgan first proposed in that work, and, in a sense, elaborated in his "Some Shakespearean Commentators" of two years later.

Yours in the Baconian faith,

J. HAROLD MCCHESENEY.

21, Webster Avenue, Newark, New Jersey, August 21st, 1910.

[No objection was taken to the rejection of cyphers by Dr. Morgan. He is entitled to his opinion. The "strictures," if so the remarks in BACONIANA may be designated, were solely directed against Dr. Morgan's intolerance and vituperation towards those who consider alleged discoveries of cypher should be investigated, and to these alone. No comment was made on the opinions he held. It is not a question, as the writer suggests, of whether Baconians can afford to lose Dr. Morgan. That gentleman has never been a whole-hearted Baconian. His autobiography, recently published, makes it clear that he is not of the Baconian fold. Dr. Wallace's much-vaunted discoveries do not yield the slightest confirmation of any theory so void of foundation as that William Shakspeare was "the owner by

purchase and stage mounter of the plays." They shed no light on the point at issue in the controversy. The writer of the so-called "strictures" has never been convinced of the sufficiency of the evidence in favour of the Donnelly cypher, Dr. Ward Owen's word cypher, or of Mrs. Gallup's Bi-literal cypher.—ED.]

TO THE EDITOR OF "BACONIANA."

This book is interesting on account of its remarkable dedication to Francis Bacon.

THE ATTORNEY'S ACADEMY:

or, The manner and Forme of proceeding Practically, upon any Suite, Plaint, or Action whatsoever, in any Court of Record whatsoever, within this Kingdome, Especially In the great Courts of Westminster, etc.

London,

Printed for Benjamin Fisher, and are to be sold at his Shop in Aldersgate street, at the signe of the Talbot, 1630.

(The first edition was printed in 1623.)

To
TRUE NOBILITY,
AND TRYDE LEARNING,
BEHOLDEN

To no Mountaine for Eminence, nor Supportment
for his Height, FRANCIS, Lord Verulam, and Viscount St.
Albanes.

O Giue me leaue to pull the Curtaine by,
That clouds thy Worth in such obscurity,
Good *Seneca*, stay but a while thy bleeding,
T' accept what I receiued at thy Reading:
Here I present it in a solemne strayne,
And thus I pluckt the Curtayne backe againe.

The same

THOMAS POWELL.

This dedication is also in the first edition (1623). The remark about the "Curtain" that "clouds thy worth in such obscurity" is very significant, because in 1623 Bacon could hardly be called an obscure personage. Why does Powell call him *Seneca*? Certainly James later made Bacon's heart, if not his veins, bleed.

Seneca was a rhetorician and philosopher, and his knowledge of human life was wide and varied. This being the case, we are not surprised to learn from Quintilian that he was the author of "Tragedies," although brought out anonymously.

In the introduction to Seneca's "Morals," Camelot series (1888), Walter Clod makes the following remarks, prefacing what is called a translation of Seneca's works made by Thomas Lodge. [Publisher, Will Staneby, 1614, London.] "Though called a translation, Lodge's work approaches nearer to being a paraphrase." Alterations are sparingly introduced, "under the impression that Lodge's prose will have an interest of its own." Is it Lodge's work? Without noticing who the translator or paraphraser happened to be, this "Morals" of Seneca struck me on reading it as being Baconian from start to finish. On turning to the title-page I was astonished to see it was Lodge the actor.

Seneca's ten "Tragedies" were translated early in Elizabeth's reign by five scholars—Neville, Neice, Studely, Jasper Heywood, and John Newton; the latter collected them all together (1581). It is interesting to know that Montaigne was considerably struck with a MS. of Seneca in the Vatican, especially when it is remembered that some people believe he was on that occasion accompanied by Francis Bacon at the age of nineteen. "I went to see the Library of the Vatican . . . the chests which were opened for my inspection. I saw many MSS. of which I chiefly remarked a Seneca and the *Opuscula* of Plutarch . . . Our Ambassador quitted Rome . . . without ever having seen the library, and he complained because pressure had been put upon him to beg this favour of Cardinal Charlet that he had never been allowed to inspect the MS. of Seneca, which he greatly desired to see. It was my good luck which carried me on to success, for having heard of the Ambassador's failure, I was in despair." Montaigne also says: "March 6th I inspected the Library . . . any one may visit it and make what extracts he likes . . . I was taken to every part by a gentleman who invited me to make use of it as often as I might desire." He stayed in Rome after that six weeks, and pointedly says: "The Library was open almost every morning." We may reasonably suppose extracts from precious works were made there. I append an interesting advertisement of Jasper Heywood's translation.

"HEYWOOD (Jasper). The Seconde Tragedie of Seneca entituled Thyestes faithfully Englished by Jasper Heywood fellowe of Alsolne College in Oxforde. 16mo (some margins and letters of text restored), **black letter**, title within woodcut border dated 1534.

"*Imprinted at London in Fleetestrete, in the house late Thomas Berthelettes, 1560.*

"°° The excessively rare FIRST EDITION, of which I am able to trace the existence of no more than three copies, perfect and imperfect. It is one of the earliest tragedies in the English lan-

guage, and it is preceded by a dedication, address to the reader, and preface, all in verse, occupying thirty pages. In the last named the translator reviews contemporary poets, and gives some of his experiences with printers. He takes some liberty with the original, and adds a whole scene to the fifth act, despite certain protest in the preface as to being faithful to his beloved author, who appears to him in a vision.

"Jasper Heywood was the son of John Heywood, the celebrated epigrammatist. Two years after publishing the above tragedy he became a Jesuit at Rome, and was Superior of the English Jesuit mission, 1851, being finally banished from England in 1585."

A STAUNCH BACONIAN.

REVIEWS.

Who was Shakespeare? An appeal to fact and reason by Professor Gustave Holzer, Heidelberg. Translated from the German by R. M. Theobald, M.D. Robert Banks and Son, London. 32pp., 8vo royal. 2d.

PROFESSOR HOLZER, of Heidelberg, is held in high esteem as a distinguished scholar. He and Dr. Konrad Meier, of Dresden, are the two principal representatives of Baconianism in Germany. The triumphant vindication of the great philosopher and poet is safe in their hands. The pamphlet, for which we are now indebted to Professor Holzer, contains little that is new, but the situation is reviewed with skillful and cogent argument. The discoveries of Professor Wallace, the attacks on the Baconian authorship theory by Mr. J. M. Robertson in the recently published edition of his work on Montaigne and Shakespeare, the assumptions of Mr. Frank Harris in "The Man Shakespeare and his Tragic Life Story," are all dealt with in a forcible and scholarly manner. In the opening chapter the difficulties are made manifest of a lecturer or teacher in presenting to his students any account of the authorship of the plays on the Stratford hypothesis, in a manner which could be intelligible to minds unwarped by tradition and prejudice.

Professor Holzer characterizes as "the most senseless of all conclusions" that refuge of the languid mind:—"What does it matter who wrote those deathless dramas? We enjoy them; we delight in them; we possess them; that is enough." He adds this observation:—"This bastard axiom of criticism, in which the lowest conceivable standpoint of artistic perception finds vent, is at the same time an expression of grossest thanklessness towards the true creator of the dramas."

Whilst paying tribute to the honest manner in which Professor Wallace and his wife have rendered service to the cause of literature, the actual result of their labours is thus summed up:—

R

"The whole collection of these new facts so diligently unearthed simply tells us very much what we knew before, viz., that the Shakspeare of whom we know more than enough—the Shakspeare of Stratford-on-Avon—was shareholder, or partly owner, of two theatres, and was a stage-player of third-rate rank; that in London he became wealthy, and purchased houses and lands in Stratford." Truly Professor Holzer points out that much wandering in a labyrinth of error might have been avoided had Schlegel—when in 1808 he declares that "all that was known about Shakspeare's person was blind misapprehension"—taken one step forward and at the same time introduced a more scientific method of investigation. He would have commanded respectful consideration where poor Delia Bacon, great as were her intellectual faculties, failed to do so. It is open to question, however, whether at any previous period in the history of English thought it would have been possible for the marvellous versatility of Francis Bacon to be recognised. To-day this is the stumbling-block to nine men out of every ten who, with a fair knowledge of the Shakespeare plays and poems and a little knowledge of Bacon's works, principally confined to his Essays, are prepared to listen with some degree of tolerance to the case in favour of the Bacon authorship. Men will not take the trouble to examine for themselves the evidence for that case and weigh its value. They prefer to rely on the accepted view and justify themselves by enumerating the distinguished literary men in whose company they find themselves. One of the most distinguished of such Professor Holzer thus describes:—"John M. Robertson is an example of the fact that fanatical and devoted allegiance to tradition ultimately leads to mental blindness." The masterly way in which the author exposes the shifts and contrivances which Mr. Robertson is driven to adopt in endeavouring to reconcile his paradoxical position is probably the best portion of the pamphlet. Mr. Robertson's position is inexplicable. He approaches the study of the Shakespeare plays with an unfettered mind. He knows Bacon's works as few living men know them. He has edited the most useful edition of Bacon's philosophical works yet published.* He has written one of the most powerful defences of Bacon's character extant.† It is there that he describes Macaulay's Essay as "a masterpiece of zealous injustice and impassioned untruth," and yet he is a determined opponent of the Baconian theory of authorship. Why is this? Here are two reasons among others:—Mr. Robertson has definitely committed himself, in opposition to Professor Churton Collins, Professor Baynes, and the majority of the Shakespeare scholars, to the view that the author of the plays and poems was without learning. Referring to the lines adopted by such, he says:—"The sooner such argumentation is given up the sooner

* Philosophical Works of Francis Bacon. Edited by J. M. Robertson; George Routledge and Sons, Limited, London, 1905.

† "Pioneer Humanists." Watts & Co, London, 1907.

will the Baconian theory be abandoned." The other is that Mr. Robertson has studied Bacon's works as an enthusiastic admirer of Spedding. He justly holds the great biographer in high esteem. So far does he let his enthusiasm carry him that he affirms "that there must have been something remarkable about the man (Bacon) whose work and personality after two hundred years could so possess such a follower." Holding such a view of Spedding, it is not to be wondered at that Mr. Robertson adopts the error which he made when he contemplated Bacon almost entirely as a politician and philosopher, dealing almost exclusively with the last twenty-six years of his life and forgetting that a man's habit of thought, passion and inclinations is seldom the same after he has passed his forty-fifth year as it was in his earlier days.

It is stated by Mr. Venables "that while he (Spedding) knew thoroughly the English history of the reigns of Elizabeth and James, he knew in detail no other history and was tranquilly content, despite his academic culture, to be ignorant of many things that ordinary people were supposed to know. He was in the habit of saying that he got undeserved credit for knowledge because no one could believe that such a man could be so profoundly ignorant." This is not the case with Mr. Robertson. It would be difficult to find any subject with which he is not conversant, and yet he follows in the footsteps of his hero with "mental blindness." These remarks only go to enhance the value of Professor Holzer's work, in which he criticises so successfully Mr. Robertson's paradoxical position.

Mr. Frank Harris is a foeman of a different character, and is aptly characterized as possessing "the mental and moral qualities of an anti-Baconian in highest development, who has equipped himself in fullest perfection for this department of his work, most pitilessly tramples down every dissenting opinion, and seasons his wisdom with excessively scornful insults at anyone who takes different views from his own."

"The Man Shakespeare" of the Baconians is an excellent chapter, but the description there drawn will not be accepted by all Baconians. There are aspects of Francis Bacon's marvellous intellectual powers yet to be proclaimed, and there is a side of his character yet to be appreciated.

The concluding chapter gives the opinion of Mr. G. G. Greenwood (whom the Professor designates "the author of the epoch-making book, 'The Shakespeare Problem Re-stated'") on the Wallace discoveries and that of Sir Edwin Durning Lawrence on the monument and portrait. The translation has been admirably made by Dr. Theobald, who in a preface handles Professor Dowden's article of "The Self-revelment of Shakespeare," which appeared in the *Contemporary Review* for November, 1908.

The Hidden Signatures of Francesco Colonna and Francis Bacon.

A comparison of their methods by William Stone Booth.
Foolscap. London: Constable & Co., Limited.

THIS book is written in continuation of "Some Acrostic Signatures of Francis Bacon," published in May, 1909. In the first section the author shows the method by which Francesco Colonna concealed his signature to his famous folio, the "Hypnerotomachia Poliphili." In the second is explained the typographical trick by which Francis Bacon put his name to the first folio of William Shakespeare's "Comedies, Histories, and Tragedies." In showing the correspondence of method adopted by the two authors it is pointed out that—

Each man used the first spoken line of each section (chapter or play) taken in its proper sequence throughout his folio.

Each man began his signature with the first letter of the first section of the body of the folio.

Each man ignored the prefatory matter, which consequently serves for a blind—intentional or not.

Each man arranged a typographical hint for the suspicious reader.

Each man worked on initials of words in the first spoken lines of each section.

So far the method of the two men follow well-worn historical precedent. The only difference between the methods of the two acrostic-makers lies in the fact that, whereas in Colonna's folio only the first initials are used, in Shakespeare's folio the letters, whilst following in their proper order, extend between two fixed points. In a mechanical sense (says the author) the trick of Francis Bacon is as precise and as definite as that of Francesco Colonna, and as inevitable. There are four large folding diagrams, by the aid of which the reader is enabled with ease to follow the spelling out of the signatures. Section III. is devoted to the rotula in the table of contents of the Shakespeare folio, being a numerical key to the signature. Section IV. is devoted to a recapitulation of the closely-reasoned argument of the late Rev. Walter Begley in "Is it Shakespeare?" to the effect that Marston and Hall each supposed their contemporary, Francis Bacon, to be the author of *Venus and Adonis*. The proof of Begley's deductions, Mr. Booth claims, will be found on pages 574—577 of his previous work. Section V. contains evidence that Bacon wrote a play entitled *Richard II.* In Section VI. is advanced contemporary evidence that Bacon was a poet and a wit. There is an epilogue consisting of a quotation from "The Advancement of Learning" and three appendices—(a) The "faking" of a title-page; (b) a practical joke by John Milton; (c) a list of books bearing on the controversy.

It is impossible to do justice to Mr. Booth's work in the space here available. The reader can readily trace by the aid of the diagrams the signature as identified by the author with exactitude. Much of the testimony which appears in the later sections

has been published before, but it is here re-stated with clearness and convincing force. The "faking" of a title-page gives a definite instance where "good Mr. Reynolds," one of Essex's secretaries, received written instructions from H. Cuffe, acting for Essex in publishing an account of the action at Cadiz, to obtain, if possible, the consent of Fulke Grevill to permit his initials to be used in the inscription, adding, "If he be unwilling, you may put R. B., which some no doubt will interpret to be Beale. But it skills not."

John Milton's practical joke on William Marshall, the engraver of his portrait, is a good story.

The book is admirably produced and should find a place on the bookshelf of every Baconian. It may be obtained from the library of the Society.

Certain Acute and Short Sentences of Francis Bacon. By Miss A. A. Leith. Gorhambury Press, 114, Camberwell Road, S.E. 8vo foolscap, paper covers, 4d.

MISS ALICIA A. LEITH has published a charming little collection of extracts from Bacon's works under the title of "Certain Acute and Short Sentences of Francis Bacon."

Miss Leith has taken for her guide the instructions contained in the *De Augmentis*, where it is written: "The best way of forming this collection, both for conciseness and use, were judged to be that of winding up these places into certain acute and short sentences, as into so many clues which may occasionally be wound off into larger discourses."

On the title-page of the little book will be found as a motto the next sentence in the *De Augmentis*: "'Tis highly proper to have the whole . . . orderly digested under heads and titles whereto anyone may occasionally turn on a sudden, as to a storehouse furnished for present use."

Every page is covered with wisdom—every sentence glistens. Probably there is no other author except Shakespeare from whose writings such a wealth of wise sayings could be drawn. The compilation has been done "with great diligence, fidelity and judgment," and "the whole is orderly digested under heads and titles." Copies may be obtained from the Author, 10, Clorane Gardens, Hampstead, from the office of the Society, or through any bookseller. It is already on sale in Geneva, Ottawa, and Buenos Ayres.

Francis Bacon: A Sketch of his Life, Works and Literary Friends; chiefly from a bibliographical point of view, by G. Walter Steeves, M.D., with forty-three illustrations. Methuen and Co., Limited. 8vo. demy, 230pp. 6s. net.

THIS is a very acceptable book of a rare type. It is written by

an ardent and enthusiastic student of Bacon, who is not committed to the Shakespearean authorship theory. Such men are seldom to be met with now-a-days. It is a regrettable fact that if the books written by those who are classed as Baconians be excluded, for every book or discourse in English written on Bacon's life or philosophy, probably five or six will be found written by French authors. It is true, though greatly to be deplored, that if the Essays be excepted Bacon is read by few Englishmen outside the Shakspeare heretics, and none too well even by them. Dr. Steeves, in his preface, whilst refusing to enter the argumentative arena of disputed facts, says, "Nevertheless, I am glad to have this opportunity of adding that if in the prosecution of such studies, whatever the motive, the public are led to take a deeper interest in the great literature of the Elizabethan period, especially that of Bacon and Shakespeare, then such disputes have not altogether been in vain."

An incentive to study is always useful. The desire in a controversy to silence opponents provides this incentive. But as a rule this only produces a superficial knowledge of the subject. Even if he were not the author of the Shakespeare plays and poems, Bacon stands out in that period as the author who will repay more than any other a devoted and thorough study of his works. In this respect he stands pre-eminent. As an aid to students who approach Bacon's works with such an intention this work is of great value. Its plan is well conceived. It contains a sketch of his life, an account of his works classified under early writings, philosophical, literary, professional, letters and posthumous works.

The life is written impartially. Dr. Steeves does not acquit Bacon from blame, as does Spedding, for his share in the arraignment of Essex. He says, "Bacon's attitude can never be altogether excused." In considering Bacon's behaviour it may be that the author has not fully grasped the circumstances in which Bacon was placed. It would have been impossible for him to adopt the course suggested in the following sentence:—"When he found he could produce no impression, in favour of Essex, on the Queen privately, he might have nobly stood aside altogether and left the prosecution to other hands." Had Bacon done so it is probable that the first small collection of ten Essays would have been all the literary works which would have come down to posterity under his name. The "*Novum Organum*" would never have been written. Bacon's indebtedness to Essex is generally overrated. The Twickenham gift was well earned by the services of the Bacon brothers. Whatever may have been Essex's intentions in furthering Bacon's advancement in the State it is beyond doubt that had Essex not befriended him he would have been saved those terrible disappointments which caused him to "become a sorry book-maker," and that his great administrative and organising powers would have been accepted by the State many years before they

were. Bodley's testimony as to his experience of Essex's advocacy is conclusive on this point.^o

Dr. Steeves truly affirms: "It may be assumed that the history of a life should never be considered apart from its environment, or without a complete knowledge of the history of the period. . . . The first step, therefore, in the study of life should be a study of the reigns of Queen Elizabeth and James the First; more especially the intricacies of the former period." This is so, but the closer and more thorough the study of those reigns, the more clearly does the student recognise how effectually the intricacies escape his ken. If the true history from Bacon's pen ever becomes available, and the hope that it will may be cherished, it may be found that the facts are not as they appear to be on the insufficient information which has come down to this generation. Dr. Steeves has conscientiously endeavoured to form a true estimate of Francis Bacon's personality and character. If further data be forthcoming on which to base that estimate he may find that he has not erred on the side of leniency.

The concluding chapter is on Bacon's literary friends and their relation to his work. Short accounts are given of William Rawley, Ben Jonson, George Herbert, Sir Thomas Meautys, Sir Thomas Bodley, Sir Henry Wotton, John Selden, Thomas Hobbes and Sir John Constable. But how little is known of their connection with Bacon or their relation to his work.

It is a singular fact that Bacon mentions in his works so few of his contemporaries. He refers to Gallileo, Bruno, Gilbert, Harvey. As an introduction to the study of Bacon and his works Dr. Steeves's book is admirable and should be read by every student. The illustrations and facsimiles of the title-pages of early editions of the works add greatly to the interest of the volume. There is a reproduction of a contemporary manuscript of "The Charge against Robert Earle of Somerset concerninge the Poysoninge of Overbery, 1606." It is in Bacon's handwriting, although that fact is not stated.

^o See BACONIANA, Vol. VII., Third Series, page 117.

SONNET—ON FIRST READING THE ESSAYS
OF LORD BACON.

O VERULAM, my master ! oft have I,
Enraptured dwelling on the throbbing page
Where king and soldier, jester, priest, and mage,
Breathing and passionate, in turn strode by,—
Oft have I mixt rejoicing with a sigh,
Lamenting that such observation sage,
Such sacred fire, such keen poetic rage
But once should stream in glory from on high,—
And now, the joy of it ! to find the same
Sweet satisfying perfectness in thee,
The calm, the majesty, the mighty flame
Which only Shakspeare seemed to hold in fee,—
Well mightst thou keep thy poethood concealed,
Who needed not the laurels it would yield !

JULIA DITTO YOUNG

FRANCIS BACON

Y gwir yn erbyn y byd.

ILLUSTRIOUS son of an illustrious sire !
Immortal mortal—deathless still, though dead—
Whose “heavenly alchemy,” with golden fire,
Could gild the “pale stream” in its sandy bed—
Had I the power to paint thee as I ought,
Philosopher and poet, doubly great !
With courtliest grace thy wit and wisest thought
Should reign for ever throned in sovran state.
What though awhile the darkening cloud may hide
Thy splendour from our eyes, yet soon shalt thou
Shine forth in all thy glory long denied ;
And Truth shall shed its halo round thy brow :
For though the darkness linger through the night,
The morning comes, and morn shall bring the light.

S. W.

